

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

John - Juxon, William

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

John

(Ἰωάννη, the Greek form of *Jehohanan*; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 15, 2), a common name among the Jews after the captivity.

I. *In the Apocrypha* the following occur under this rendering in the A.V.:

- 1.** The father of Matathias, of the Maccabean family (1 Macc. 2:1). *SEE MACCABEES.*
- 2.** The son of Accos, and father of Eupolemus, which latter was one of the envoys sent by Judas Maccabaeus to Rome (1 Macc. 8:17; 2 Macc. 4:11).
- 3.** Surnamed *Caddis* (q.v.), the eldest son of the same Matathias, and one of the Maccabean brothers (1 Macc. 2:2, *Johanan*; less correctly *Joseph* in 2 Macc. 8:22). He had been sent by his brother Jonathan on a message to the Nabathaeans, when he was taken prisoner by “the children of Jambri” (q.v.), from Medeba, and appears to have been put to death by them (1 Macc. 9:35, 36, 38)
- 4.** One of the persons sent by the Jews with a petition to the Syrian general Lysias (2 Macc. 11:17).
- 5.** The son of Simon Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 13:53; 16:1, 2, 9, 19, 21, 23), better known by the epithet HYRCANUS *SEE HYRCANUS* (q.v.).

II. *In the New Testament* the following are all that are mentioned, besides JOHN THE APOSTLE and JOHN THE BAPTIST, who are noticed separately below:

- 1.** One of the high priest’s family, who, with Annas and Caiaphas, sat in judgment upon the apostles Peter and John for their cure of the lame man and preaching in the Temple (⁴⁰¹⁶Acts 4:6), A.D. 29. Lightfoot identifies him with R. Johanan Ben-Zachai, who lived forty years before the destruction of the Temple, and was president of the great synagogue after its removal to Jabne, or Jamnia (Lightfoot, *Cent. Chor. Matth. praef.* ch. 15; see also Selden, *De Synedriis*, 2, ch. 15). Grotius merely says he was known to Rabbinical writers as “John the priest” (*Comm. in Act.* 4). — Smith.
- 2.** The Hebrew name of the evangelist MARK *SEE MARK* (q.v.), who throughout the narrative of the Acts is designated by the name by which he was known among his countrymen (⁴¹²²Acts 12:12, 25; 13:5, 13; 15:37).

III. *In Josephus* the following are the most noteworthy of this name, besides the above and JOHN OF GISCHALA, whom we notice separately below:

- 1.** A high priest (son of Judas, and grandson of Eliashib), who slew his brother Jesus in the Temple, thereby provoking the vengeance of Bagoses, the Persian viceroy under Artaxerxes (*Ant.* 11, 7, 1). He corresponds to the Jonathan (q.v.), son of Joiada, of ^{<4620>}Nehemiah 12:10, 11. **SEE HIGH PRIEST.**
- 2.** Son of Dorcas, sent by the Sicarii with ten executioners to murder the persons taken into custody by John of Gischala on his arrival in Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, 4, 3, 5).
- 3.** Son of Sosas, one of the four popular generals of the Idumaeans who marched to Jerusalem in aid of the zealots at the instance of John of Gischala (Josephus. *War*, 4, 4, 2). He was possibly the same with John the Essene, spoken of as commander of the toparchy of Shamma at an earlier stage of the war (*ib.* 2, 20, 4; comp. 3, 2, 1). He was mortally wounded by a dart during the final siege (*ib.* 5, 6, 5).

John the Apostle

(Ἰωάννης) *the Apostle*, and brother of the apostle James “the greater” (^{<402>}Matthew 4:21; 10:2; ^{<4019>}Mark 1:19; 3:17; 10:35; ^{<4150>}Luke 5:10; 8:3; etc.).

I. *Personal History.* —

1. Early Life. — It is probable that he was born at Bethsaida, on the Lake of Galilee. The general impression left on us by the Gospel narrative is that he was younger than the brother whose name commonly precedes his (^{<402>}Matthew 4:21; 10:3; 17:1, etc.; but compare ^{<4028>}Luke 9:28, where the order is inverted in most codices), younger than his friend Peter, possibly also than his Master. The life which was protracted to the time of Trajan (Eusebius, *H.E.* 3, 23, following Irenaeus) can hardly have begun before the year B.C. 4 of the Dionysian era. The Gospels give us the name of his father Zebedaeus (^{<402>}Matthew 4:21) and his mother Salome (comp. ^{<4075>}Matthew 27:56 with ^{<4150>}Mark 15:40; 16:1). Of the former we know nothing more. **SEE ZEBEDEE.** The traditions of the fourth century (Epiphanius, 3, *Hoer.* 78) make the latter the daughter of Joseph by his first

wife, and consequently half sister to our Lord. By some recent critics she has been identified with the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, in ^{<4025>}John 19:25 (Wieseler, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, p. 648). Ewald (*Gesch. Israels*, v. 171) adopts Wieseler's conjecture, and connects it with his own hypothesis, that the sons of Zebedee, and our Lord, as well as the Baptist, were of the tribe of Levi. On the other hand, more sober critics, like Neander (*Pflanz. u. Leit.* p. 609 [4th ed.]) and Lücke (*Johannes*, 1, 9), reject both the tradition and the conjecture. **SEE SALOME**. They lived, it may be inferred from ^{<4044>}John 1:44, in or near the same town as those who were afterwards the companions and partners of their children. **SEE BETHSAIDA**. There, on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, the apostle and his brother grew up. The mention of the "hired servants" (^{<4020>}Mark 1:20), of his mother's "substance" (^{<4083>}ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, ^{<4083>}Luke 8:3), of "his own house" (^{<4027>}τὰ ἴδια, ^{<4027>}John 19:27), implies a position removed by at least some steps from absolute poverty. The fact that the apostle was known to the high priest Caiaphas, as that knowledge was hardly likely to have begun after he had avowed himself the disciple of Jesus of Nazareth, suggests the probability of some early intimacy between the two men or their families. The name which the parents gave to their younger child was too common to serve as the ground of any special inference; but it deserves notice (1) that the name appears among the kindred of Caiaphas (^{<4045>}Acts 4:6); (2) that it was given to a priestly child, the son of Zacharias (^{<4013>}Luke 1:13), as the embodiment and symbol of Messianic hopes. The frequent occurrence of the name at this period, unconnected as it was with any of the great deeds of the old heroic days of Israel, is indeed in itself significant as a sign of that yearning and expectation which then characterized not only the more faithful and devout (^{<4025>}Luke 2:25, 38), but the whole people. The prominence given to it by the wonders connected with the birth of the future Baptist may have imparted a meaning to it for the parents of the future evangelist which it would not otherwise have had. Of the character of Zebedeus we have hardly the slightest trace. He interposes no refusal when his sons are called on to leave him (^{<4021>}Matthew 4:21). After this he disappears from the scene of the Gospel history, and we are led to infer that he had died before his wife followed her children in their work of ministration. Her character meets us as presenting the same marked features as those which were conspicuous in her son. From her, who followed Jesus and ministered to him of her substance (^{<4083>}Luke 8:3), who sought for her two sons that they might sit, one on his right hand, the other on his left, in his kingdom (^{<4020>}Matthew 20:20), he might well derive

his strong affections, his capacity for giving and receiving love, his eagerness for the speedy manifestation of the Messiah's kingdom. The early years of the apostle we may believe to have passed under this influence. He would be trained in all that constituted the ordinary education of Jewish boyhood. Though not taught in the schools of Jerusalem, and therefore, in later life, liable to the reproach of having no recognized position as a teacher, no Rabbinical education (~~<4013>~~ Acts 4:13), he would yet be taught to read the Law and observe its precepts, to feed on the writings of the prophets with the feeling that their accomplishment was not far off.

2. Incidents recorded of him in the New Testament. — The ordinary life of the fisherman of the Sea of Galilee was at last broken in upon by the news that a prophet had once more appeared. The voice of John the Baptist was heard in the wilderness of Judaea, and the publicans, peasants, soldiers, and fishermen of Galilee gathered round him. Among these were the two sons of Zebedaeus and their friends. With them perhaps was One whom as yet they knew not. They heard, it may be, of John's protests against the vices of their own ruler — against the hypocrisy of Pharisees and Scribes. But they heard also, it is clear, words which spoke to them of their own sins — of their own need of a deliverer. The words "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins" imply that those who heard them would enter into the blessedness of which they spoke. Assuming that the unnamed disciple of ~~<3037>~~ John 1:37-40 was the evangelist himself, we are led to think of that meeting, of the lengthened interview that followed it as the starting point of the entire devotion of heart and soul which lasted through his whole life. Then Jesus loved him as he loved all earnest seekers after righteousness and truth (comp. ~~<4102>~~ Mark 10:21). The words of that evening, though unrecorded, were mighty in their effect. The disciples (John apparently among them) followed their new teacher to Galilee (~~<3044>~~ John 1:44), were with him, as such, at the marriage feast of Cana (~~<3010>~~ John 2:2), journeyed with him to Capernaum, and thence to Jerusalem (~~<3022>~~ John 2:12, 22), came back through Samaria (~~<3008>~~ John 4:8), and then, for some uncertain interval of time, returned to their former occupations. The uncertainty which hangs over the narratives of ~~<4008>~~ Matthew 4:18 and ~~<3011>~~ Luke 5:1-11 (comp. the arguments for and against their relating to the same events in Lampe, *Comment. ad Joann.* 1, 20), leaves us in doubt whether they received a special call to become "fishers of men" once only or twice. In either case they gave up the employment of their life and went to do a work like it, and yet unlike, in God's spiritual kingdom. From this time they take their place

among the company of disciples. Only here and there are there traces of individual character, of special turning points in their lives. Soon they find themselves in the number of the Twelve who are chosen, not as disciples only, but as their Lord's delegates — representatives — apostles. In all the lists of the Twelve those four names of the sons of Jonah and Zebedaeus stand foremost. They come within the innermost circle of their Lord's friends, and are as the **ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι**. The three, Peter, James, and John, are with him when none else are, in the chamber of death (**<4157>**Mark 5:37), in the glory of the transfiguration (**<4101>**Matthew 17:1), when he forewarns them of the destruction of the Holy City (**<4133>**Mark 13:3, Andrew, in this instance, with them), in the agony of Gethsemane. Peter is throughout the leader of that band; to John belongs the yet more memorable distinction of being the disciple whom Jesus loved. This love is returned with a more single, undivided heart by him than by any other. If Peter is the **φιλόχριστος**, John is the **φιλιησοῦς** (Grotius, *Prolegom. in Joann.*). Some striking facts indicate why this was so; what the character was which was thus worthy of the love of Jesus of Nazareth.. They hardly sustain the popular notion, fostered by the received types of Christian art, of a nature gentle, yielding, feminine. The name Boanerges (**<4087>**Mark 3:17) implies a vehemence, zeal, intensity, which gave to those who had it the might of Sons of Thunder. That spirit broke out once and again when they joined their mother in asking for the highest places in the kingdom of their Master, and declared that they were ready to face the dark terrors of the cup that he drank, and the baptism that he was baptized with (**<4111>**Matthew 20:20-24; **<4105>**Mark 10:35-41) — when they rebuked one who cast out devils in their Lord's name because he was not one of their company (**<4094>**Luke 9:49) — when they sought to call down fire from heaven upon a village of the Samaritans (**<4054>**Luke 9:54). About this time Salome, as if her husband had died, takes her place among the women who followed Jesus in Galilee (**<4083>**Luke 8:3), ministering to him of their substance, and went up with him in his last journey to Jerusalem (**<4075>**Luke 22:55). Through her, we may well believe, John first came to know Mary Magdalene, whose character he depicts with such a life-like touch, and that other Mary, to whom he was afterwards to stand in so close and special a relation. The fullness of his narrative of what the other evangelists omit (**<4100>**John 11) leads to the conclusion that he was united also by some special ties of intimacy to the family of Bethany. It is not necessary to dwell at length on the familiar history of the Last Supper. What is characteristic is that he is there, as ever, the disciple whom Jesus loved; and, as the chosen and a

favored friend, reclines at table with his head upon his Master's breast (^{<4813>}John 13:23). To him the eager Peter — they had been sent together to prepare the supper (^{<4218>}Luke 22:8) — makes signs of impatient questioning that he should ask what was not likely to be answered if it came from any other (^{<4813>}John 13:24). As they go out to the Mount of Olives the chosen three are nearest to their Master. They only are within sight or hearing of the conflict in Gethsemane (^{<4857>}Matthew 26:37). When the betrayal is accomplished, Peter and John, after the first moment of confusion, follow afar off, while the others simply seek safety in a hasty flight (^{<4815>}John 18:15). The personal acquaintance which existed between John and Caiaphas enabled him to gain access both for himself and Peter, but the latter remains in the porch, with the officers and servants, while John himself apparently is admitted to the council chamber, and follows Jesus thence, even to the praetorium of the Roman procurator. (^{<4816>}John 18:16, 19, 28). Thence, as if the desire to see the end, and the love which was stronger than death, sustained him through all the terrors and sorrows of that day, he followed — accompanied probably by his own mother, Mary the mother of Jesus, and Mary Magdalene — to the place of crucifixion. The teacher who had been to him as a brother leaves to him a brother's duty. He is to be as a son to the mother who is left desolate (^{<4815>}John 19:26-27). The Sabbath that followed was spent, it would appear, in the same company. He receives Peter, in spite of his denial, on the old terms of friendship. It is to them that Mary Magdalene first runs with the tidings of the emptied sepulchre (^{<4812>}John 20:2); they are the first to go together to see what the strange words meant. Not without some bearing on their respective characters is the fact that John is the most impetuous, running on most eagerly to the rock tomb; Peter, the least restrained by awe, the first to enter in and look (^{<4814>}John 20:4-6). For at least eight days they continued in Jerusalem (^{<4815>}John 20:26). Then, in the interval between the resurrection and the ascension, we find them still together on the Sea of Galilee (^{<4810>}John 21:1), as though they would calm the eager suspense of that period of expectation by a return to their old calling and their old familiar haunts. Here, too, there is a characteristic difference. John is the first to recognize in the dim form seen in the morning twilight the presence of his risen Lord; Peter the first to plunge, into the water and swim towards the shore where he stood calling to them (^{<4810>}John 21:7). The last words of the Gospel reveal to us the deep affection which united the two friends. It is not enough for Peter to know his own future. That at once suggests the question — “And what shall this man do?” (^{<4811>}John 21:21). The history of

the Acts shows the same union. They, are of course together at the ascension and on the day of Pentecost. Together they enter the Temple as worshippers (~~408~~ Acts 3:1), and protest against the threats of the Sanhedrim (4:13). They are fellow workers in the first great step of the Church's expansion. The apostle whose wrath had been roused by the unbelief of the Samaritans overcomes his national exclusiveness, and receives them as his brethren (~~408~~ Acts 8:14). The persecution which was pushed on by Saul of Tarsus did not drive him or any of the apostles from their post (~~408~~ Acts 8:1). When the persecutor came back as the convert, he, it is true, did not see him (~~409~~ Galatians 1:19), but this, of course, does not involve the inference that he had left Jerusalem. The sharper though shorter persecution which followed under Herod Agrippa brought a great sorrow to him in the martyrdom of his brother (~~410~~ Acts 12:2). His friend was driven to seek safety in flight. Fifteen years after Paul's first visit he was still at Jerusalem, and helped to take part in the great settlement of the controversy between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians (~~410~~ Acts 15:6). His position and reputation there were those of one ranking among the chief "pillars" of the Church (~~410~~ Galatians 2:9). Of the work of the apostle during this period we have hardly the slightest trace. There may have been special calls to mission work like that which drew him to Samaria. There may have been the work of teaching, organizing, exhorting the churches of Judea. His fulfilment of the solemn charge intrusted to him may have led him to a life of loving and reverent thought rather than to one of conspicuous activity. We may, at all events, feel sure that it was a time in which the natural elements of his character, with all their fiery energy, became purified and mellowed, rising step by step to that high serenity which we find perfected in the closing portion of his life. Here, too, we may, without much hesitation, accept the traditions of the Church as recording a historic fact when they ascribe to him a life of celibacy (Tertull. *De Monog.* c. 13. The absence of his name from ~~405~~ 1 Corinthians 9:5 tends to the same conclusion. It harmonizes with all we know of his character to think of his heart as so absorbed in the higher and diviner love that there was no room left for the lower and the human.

3. Sequel of his Career. — The traditions of a later age come in, with more or less show of likelihood, to fill up the great gap which separates the apostle of Jerusalem from the bishop of Ephesus. It was a natural conjecture to suppose that he remained in Judaea till the death of the Virgin released him from his trust. When this took place we can only conjecture.

The hypothesis of Baronius and Tillemont, that the Virgin accompanied him to Ephesus, has not even the authority of tradition (Lampe, 1, 51). There are no signs of his being at Jerusalem at the time of Paul's last visit (~~420~~ Acts 21). The pastoral epistles set aside the notion that he had come to Ephesus before the work of the apostle of the Gentiles was brought to its conclusion. Out of many contradictory statements, fixing his departure under Claudius, or Nero, or as late even as Domitian, we have hardly any data for doing more than rejecting the two extremes. Lampe fixes A.D. 66, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Roman forces under Cestius, as the most probable date. Nor is it certain that his work as an apostle was transferred at once from Jerusalem to Ephesus. A tradition current in the time of Augustine (*Quoest. Evang.* 2, 19), and embodied in some MSS. of the New Test., represented the 1st Epistle of John as addressed to the Parthians, and so far implied that his apostolic work had brought him into contact with them. In the earlier tradition which made the apostles formally partition out the world known to them, Parthia falls to the lot of Thomas, while John receives Proconsular Asia (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 1). In one of the legends connected with the Apostles' Creed, Peter contributes the first article, John the second; but the tradition appears with great variations as to time and order (comp. Pseudo-August. *Serm.* 240, 241). When the form of the aged disciple meets us again in the twilight of the apostolic age, we are still left in great doubt as to the extent of his work and the circumstances of his outward life. Assuming the authorship of the Epistles and the Revelation to be his, the facts which the New Test. writings assert or imply are:

(1) that, having come to Ephesus, some persecution, local or general, drove him to Patmos (~~600~~ Revelation 1:9);

(2) that the seven churches, of which Asia was the center, were special objects of his solicitude (~~601~~ Revelation 1:11); that in his work he had to encounter men who denied the truth on which his faith rested (~~600~~ 1 John 4:1; 2 John 7), and others who, with a railing and malignant temper, disputed his authority (3 John 9, 10). If to this we add that he must have outlived all, or nearly all, of those who had been the friends and companions even of his maturer years that this lingering age gave strength to an old imagination that his Lord had promised him immortality (~~623~~ John 21:23) — that, as if remembering the actual words which had been thus perverted, the longing of his soul gathered itself up in the cry, “Even so, come, Lord Jesus” (~~621~~ Revelation 22:20) — that from some who spoke

with authority he received a solemn attestation of the confidence they reposed in him (~~John~~ John 21:24) — we have stated all that has any claim to the character of historical truth. The picture which tradition fills up for us has the merit of being full and vivid, but it blends together, without much regard to harmony, things probable and improbable. He is shipwrecked off Ephesus (Simeon Metaph. *In vita Johann.* c. 2; Lampe, 1, 47), and arrives there in time to check the progress of the heresies which sprang up after Paul's departure. Then, or at a later period, he numbers among his disciples men like Polycarp, Papias, Ignatius (Jerome, *De vir. Illust.* c. 17). In the persecution under Domitian he is taken to Rome, and there, by his boldness, though not by death, gains the crown of martyrdom. The boiling oil into which he is thrown has no power to hurt him (Tertull. *De Proescript.* c. 36). The scene of the supposed miracle was outside the Porta Latina, and hence the Western Church commemorates it by the special festival of "St. John Port. Latin." on May 6th. He is then sent to labor in the mines, and Patmos is the place of his exile (Victorinus, *In Apoc.* 9; Lampe, 1, 66). The accession of Nerva frees him from danger, and he returns to Ephesus. There he settles the canon of the Gospel history by formally attesting the truth of the first three Gospels, and writing his own to supply what they left wanting (Euseb. *H.E.* 3, 24). The elders of the Church are gathered together, and he, as by a sudden inspiration, begins with the wonderful opening, "In the beginning was the word" (Jerome, *De vir. Illust.* 29). Heresies continue to show themselves, but he meets them with the strongest possible protest. He refuses to pass under the same roof (that of the public baths of Ephesus) with their foremost leader, lest the house should fall down on them and crush them (Iren. 3, 3; Euseb. *H.E.* 3, 28; 4, 14). Eusebius and Irenaeus make Cerinthus the heretic. In Epiphanius (*Hoer.* 30, c. 24) Ebion is the hero of the story. To modern feelings the anecdote may seem at variance with the character of the apostle of love, but it is hardly more than the development in act of the principle of 2 John 10. To the mind of Epiphanius there was a difficulty of another kind: nothing less than a special inspiration could account for such a departure from an ascetic life as going to a bath at all. Through his agency the great temple of Artemis is at last reft of its magnificence, and even (!) leveled with the ground (Cyril. Alex. *Orat. de Mar. Virg.;* Nicephor. *H.E.* 2, 42; Lampe, 1, 90). He introduces and perpetuates the Jewish mode of celebrating the Easter feast (Eusebius, *H.E.* 3, 3) — at Ephesus, if not before, as one who was a true priest of the Lord. bearing on his brow the plate of gold (πέταλον; compare Suicer. *Thes. s.v.*) with the

sacred name engraved on it, which was the badge of the Jewish pontiff (Polycrates, in Eusebius, *H.E.* 3, 31; 5, 24). In strange contrast with this ideal exaltation, a later tradition tells how the old man used to find pleasure in the playfulness and fondness of a favorite bird, and defended himself against the charge of unworthy trifling by the familiar apologue of the bow that must sometimes be unbent (Cassian. *Collat.* 24, c. 2). More true to the N.T. character of the apostle is the story, told with so much power and beauty by Clement of Alexandria (*Quis dives*, c. 42), of his special and loving interest in the younger members of his flock — of his eagerness and courage in the attempt to rescue one of them who had fallen into evil courses. The scene of the old and loving man, standing face to face with the outlaw chief whom, in days gone by, he had baptized, and winning him to repentance is one which we could gladly look on as belonging to his actual life — part of a story which is, in Clement’s words οὐ μῦθος ἀλλὰ λόγος. Not less beautiful is that other scene which comes before us as the last act of his life. When all capacity to work and teach is gone — when there is no strength even to stand — the spirit still retains its power to love, and the lips are still opened to repeat, without change and variation, the command which summed up all his Master’s will, “Little children, love one another” (Jerome, *in Gal.* 6). Other stories, more apocryphal and less interesting, we may pass over rapidly. That he put forth his power to raise the dead to life (Euseb. *H.E.* 5, 18); that he drank the cup of hemlock which was intended to cause his death, and suffered no harm from it (Pseudo-August. *Soliloq.*; Isidor. Hispal. *De Morte Sanct.* c. 73); that when he felt his death approaching he gave orders for the construction of his own sepulchre, and when it was finished calmly laid himself down in it and died (Augustin. *Tract. in Joann.* 124); that after his interment there were strange movements in the earth that covered him (*ib.*); that when the tomb was subsequently opened it was found empty (Niceph. *H.E.* 2, 42); that he was reserved to reappear again in conflict with the personal antichrist in the last days (Suicer, *Thes.* s.v. Ἰωάννης) these traditions, for the most part, indicate little else than the uncritical spirit of the age in which they passed current. The very time of his death lies within the region of conjecture rather than of history, and the dates that have been assigned for it range from A.D. 89 to A.D. 120 (Lampe, 1, 92).

See Perionii *Vitoe Apostol.* p. 95 sq.; Edzard *De Joanne Cerinthi proesentiam futgiente.* (Viteb. 1732); Schwollmann, *Comment. de Jo. in Pathimo exilio* (Halle, 1757); Hering, *Von d. Schule d. Apost. Joh. zu*

Ephesus (Bresl. 1774); Bishop, *Life, etc., of St. John* (London, 1827); Webb, *The Beloved Disciple* (Lond. 1848); Krummacher (in *Life of Cornelius, etc.*); Lee, *Life of St. John* (N.Y. 1854); Macfarlane, *The Disciple whom Jesus loved* (Lond. 1855); Kienkel, *Der Apostel Johannes* (Berlin, 1871).

II. The most prominent *traits of John's character* appear to have been an ardent temperament and a delicacy of sentiment. These combined to produce that devoted attachment to his Master which leads him to detail all his discourses and vindicate his character on all occasions. Yet, with all his mildness and amiability of temper — doubtless, in part, the fruit of divine grace, for we trace also a degree of selfishness in ^{<408>}Mark 9:38; 10:35 he was not altogether feminine in disposition, but possessed an energy and force of mind which gave him the title of one of the “sons of thunder” (^{<407>}Mark 3:17), bursting forth in vehement language in his writings and on one occasion calling even for rebuke (^{<405>}Luke 9:54, 55). **SEE BOANERGES.** It was these traits of mind that enabled him to take so profound and comprehensive a view of the nature and office of the incarnate Son of God, evident in all his writings, and especially developed in the introduction to his Gospel.

See Von Melle, *Entwurf einer Lebensbeschreibung und Charakteristik d. Apost. Joh.* (Heidelb. 1808); Niemeyer, *Charakteristik der Bibel*, 1, 303 sq.; Wernsdorf, *Meletema de Elogio filior. tonitruui* (Helmst. 1755); Obbar, *De Temperamento Joa. cholericico* (Gött. 1738); F. Trench, *Life and Character of John the Evangelist* (London, 1850); Stanley, *Sermons and Essays on the Apost. Age*, serm. 4; W. Grimm, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encycl.* sect. 2, pt. 22, p. 1 sq.; Ad. Monod, *Sermons (La Parole vivante)* (Par. 1858); Pressense, *Apostolic Aera*, p. 415.

John, Gospel Of.

The fourth in order of the evangelical narratives in nearly all editions, though a few MSS. place it immediately after Matthew. **SEE GOSPELS.**

I. *Genuineness.* — There is no reason to doubt that the fourth Gospel was from the beginning received in the Church as the production of the apostle whose name it bears. We may decline to accept as a testimony for this the statement at the close of the Gospel itself (^{<424>}John 21:24), for this can have the force of an independent testimony only on the supposition that the passage was added by another hand; and though there is an evident allusion

in ~~6014~~ 2 Peter 1:14 to what is recorded in ~~6218~~ John 21:18, 19, yet, as that saying of the Lord was one which tradition would be sure to send forth among the brethren (compare ver. 23), it cannot be inferred from Peter's allusion to it that it was then put on record as we have it in the Gospel. We may also admit that the passages in the writings of the apostolic fathers which have been adduced as evincing, on their part, acquaintance with this Gospel are not decisive. The passages usually cited for this purpose are Barnab. *Ep.* 5, 6, 12 (comp. ~~6184~~ John 3:14); Herm. *Past. Sim.* 9, 12 (compare ~~6007~~ John 10:7, 9; 14:6); Ignat, *Ad Magnes.* 7 (comp. ~~6124~~ John 12:49; 10:30; 14:11). See Lardner, *Works*, vol. 2. All of them *may* owe their accordance with John's statements to the influence of true tradition, or to the necessary resemblance of the just utterance of Christian thought and feeling by different men; though in three other passages cited from Ignatius (*Ad Rom.* 7; *Ad Trall.* 8; and *Ad Philad.* 7) the coincidence of the first two with ~~6162~~ John 6:32 sq., and of the last with ~~6188~~ John 3:8, is almost too close to be accounted for in this way (Ebrard, *Evang. Joh.* p. 102; Rothe, *Anfänge der Christl. Kirche*, p. 715). But Eusebius attests that this Gospel was among the books universally received in the Church (*Hist. Eccles.* 3, 25); and it cannot be doubted that it formed part of the canon of the churches, both of the East and West, before the end of the 2d century.

SEE CANON. It is in the Peshito, and in the Muratori Fragment. It is quoted or referred to by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1, 52, 61; 2, 6; *c. Tryph.* 105, etc.; compare Olshausen, *Echtheit der Kan. Evv.* p. 304 sq.), by Tatian (*Orat. ad Groecos*, 4, 13, 19), who, indeed, composed a Diatessaron (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 29; Theod. *Hoeret. Fab.* 1, 20), in preparing which he must have had this gospel before him; in the Epistle of the Church at Vienne and Lyons (Euseb. 5, 1); by Melito of Sardes (see Pitra; *Spicileg. Solmense*, 1, Prolegom. p. 5, Paris, 1852); by Athenagoras (*Leg. pro Christ.* 10); by Apollinaris (*Frag. Chronicles Pasch.* p. 14, ed. Dindorf); by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 24); and in the Clementine Homilies (19, 22, ed. Dressel, 1853), in such a way that not only is its existence proved, but evidence is afforded of the esteem in which it was held as canonical from the middle of the 2d century. Still more precise is the testimony of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who not only composed a Harmony of the four evangelists (Jerome, *De viris Illust.* 25; *Ep.* 151, *ad Algasiam*), but in an extant work (*ad Autol.* 2, 22) expressly quotes ~~6000~~ John 1:1 as part of holy Scripture, and as the production of the apostle, whom he ranks among the **πνευματοφόροι**. More important still is the testimony of Irenaeus (*Hoer.* 3, 11, 3, p. 218, ed. Grabe), both

because of his acquaintance in early youth with Polycarp, and because of the distinctness and confidence with which he asserts the Johannean origin of this Gospel. *SEE IRENAEUS*. To these testimonies may be added that of Celsus, the enemy of the Christians, who, in preparing his attack upon them, evidently had the four canonical Gospels before him, and of whose citations from them some are undoubtedly from that of John (compare Olshausen, *ut sup.* p. 349, 355; Lücke, *Comment.* 1, 68 sq., 3d edit.); which shows that, at the time when he wrote, this Gospel must have been in general acceptance by the Christians as canonical. The heretic Marcion, also, in rejecting this Gospel on dogmatical grounds, is a witness to the fact that its canonical authority was generally held by the Christians (Tertull. *c. Marcion*, 4, 5; *De Carne Christi*). That the Gospel was recognized as canonical by the Valentinians, one of the most important sects of the 2d century, is placed beyond doubt by the statement of Irenaeus (*Hoer.* 3, 11), and by the fact that it is quoted by Ptolemaeus, a disciple of Valentinus (Epiphanius. *Hoer.* 33, 3), and was commented on by Heracleon, another of his disciples, both of whom lived about the middle of the 2d century. That Valentinus himself knew and used the book is rendered probable by this, and by the statement of Tertullian (*De Proescr. Hoeret.* 38), that Valentinus accepted the Biblical canon entire, though he perverted its meaning; and this probability is raised to certainty by the fact that, in the recently discovered work of Hippolytus, Valentinus is found twice (*Philosoph.* 6, 33, 34, ed. Miller) citing the phrase ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, as applied to the devil, which occurs only in John's Gospel, and repeatedly there (12, 31; 14:30; 16:11); and also quoting the saying, ~~John~~ John 10:8, as the word of Christ. From the same source also (7, 22, 27, p. 232, 242) we learn that Basilides was acquainted with John's Gospel, and cited it; and this brings us up to the beginning of the 2d century, within a short time of the apostle's death.

This concurrence of external testimony is the more noticeable as there are certain peculiarities in the fourth Gospel which would have thrown suspicion on its genuineness had not that been placed beyond doubt by the knowledge which the Christians had of its having proceeded from the pen of John. Such pre the prominence given to the extra-Galilean ministry of our Lord the record of remarkable miracles, such as the healing of the impotent man (~~John~~ ch. 5), of the blind man (~~John~~ ch. 9), the raising from the dead of Lazarus, and others, omitted by the other evangelists; the insertion of so many discourses of Jesus, of which no hint is found in the other

Gospels, as well as the omission of remarkable facts in the evangelic history, especially the institution of the supper and the agony in the garden; and certain important apparent discrepancies between this and the synoptical Gospels. In perfect keeping with this assumption, also, is the entire tone, spirit, and character of the Gospel; it is emphatically, as Clement of Alexandria calls it, the **πνευματικὸν εὐαγγέλιον**, and breathes throughout the spirit which was characteristic of “the disciple whom Jesus loved.” The work is evidently the production of one who was, as the writer professes to be (^{<B114>}John 1:14 [comp. ^{<B100>}1 John 1:1; 4:14]; ^{<B125>}John 19:35; 21:24), an eyewitness of what he narrates; and there is a simplicity, a naturalness, and a vividness in the whole narrative, which no forger of a later age could have attained — which the very consciousness of composing what was intended to be an imposition would have precluded. The remarkable manner also in which the writer avoids introducing John by name (^{<B123>}John 13:23; 19:16; 20:2, 3, 4; ^{<B107>}John 21:7, 24) affords additional evidence that John himself was the writer. It has been urged also by some (Bleek, Ebrard, Credner) that the use of the simple **Ἰωάννης**, without in any case the addition of the usual **ὁ Βαπτιστής**, to designate the Baptist, in this Gospel, is an evidence of its being the production of John the apostle, on the ground that, “supposing the apostle not to be the writer, one would expect that he should, like the Synoptists, discriminate the Baptist from the apostle by this epithet, whereas, supposing the apostle himself to be the writer, he would feel less prompted to do so” (Bleek, *Einleit. in das N.T.* p. 148); but to this much weight cannot be attached; for, though it is probable that a writer, taking his materials from the other evangelists, would have designated John as they do, and though, as Meyer suggests (*Krit. Exeget. Comm., Einleitung in das Ev. des Johannes*, p. 23), it is probable that John, who had been a disciple of the Baptist, might prefer speaking of him by the name by which he had been accustomed to designate him during their personal intercourse rather than by his *historical* name, yet, as we cannot tell what considerations might have occurred to a forger writing in the apostle’s name to induce him to drop the distinctive epithet, it is hardly competent for us to accept this omission as a *proof* that the work is not the production of a forger. It is needless to press every minute particular into the service of the argument for the genuineness of this Gospel; it is impossible to read it without feeling that it is Johannean in all its parts, and that, had it been the production of any other than the apostle, that other must in mind, spirit, affection, circumstances, and character, have been a second John.

Attempts to impugn the genuineness of this Gospel have been comparatively recent (Guerike, *Einleitung*, p. 303). The work of Bretschneider, entitled *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epp. Johannis apost. indole et origine* (Lips. 1820), is the earliest formal attack of any importance made upon it; and this, the author has himself assured us, was made by him with a view to exciting anew and extending inquiry into the genuineness of the Johannean writings, an end which, he adds, has been gained, so that the doubts he suggested may be regarded as discharged (*Dogmatik*, 1, 268, 3d ed.). Since that work appeared, the claims of the Gospel have been opposed by Strauss in his *Leben Jesu*; by Weisse in his *Evangelische Geschichte*; by Lützelberger (*Die Kirchliche Tradition ub. d. Apost. Joh.* Lpz. 1848, and in many other forms since); by Baur (*Krit. Untersuch. über die Kanonischen Evang.*); by Hilgenfeld (*Des Evang. und die Briefe Joh. nach ihrem Lehrbegr. dargestellt*, Halle, 1849), and by others. But the reasons advanced by these writers have so little force, and have been so thoroughly replied to, that even in Germany the general opinion has reverted to the ancient and catholic belief in respect of the authorship of the fourth Gospel. See Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangel. Gesch.*; Ebrard, *Kritik d. Evangel. Geschichte* (Zür. 1850, 2d ed.); Ewald, *Jahrbuch*, 3, 146; 5, 178; Meyer, *Kritik. Exeg. Comm.* 2, Th. 2 Abt. (Gött. 1856, 3d edit.); Bleek, *Einl. in das N.T.* (Berlin, 1862); Davidson, *Introduction to the New Test.* 1, 233 sq.; Schaff, *Church History (Apostolic Age)*, § 105. The importance of the fourth Gospel as a proof of the divine character of Jesus Christ led to this special assault on its genuineness by the Rationalists of the Tübingen school and their imitators elsewhere, but without shaking the convictions of the Church at large. **SEE JESUS CHRIST**. For further details of the controversy, see Fisher, *Supernat. Origin of Christianity* (new edit. N.Y. 1870); Pressense, *Apostol. Age* (N.Y. 1871), p. 509 sq. **SEE RATIONALISM**. The most important other express treatises in opposition to the authenticity of John's Gospel are those of Bruno Bauer (Brem. 1840, Berl. 1850), Zeller (*Jahrb.* 1845 sq.), Köstlin (ib. 1853), Volkmar (in several works and arts. in Germ. journals). Scholten (Leid. 1864, etc.), Matthes (ib. 1867), Tayler (Lond. 1867); in favor, Stein (Brandenb. 1822), Crome (Lpzg. 1824), Hauff (Nürnb. 1831, and in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1846, 1849), Weitzel (ib. 1849), Mayer (Schaffh. 1854), Schneider (Berl. 1854), Tischendorf (Lpzg. 1865 and since), Riggenbach (Basel, 1866), Witticher (Elberf. 1869), Pfeiffer (St. Gall. 1870), Row (in the *Journal of Sacred Lit.* 1865, 1866, etc.),

Clarke (in the *Christian Examiner*, 1868); see also the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July, 1861, p. 553; *Westminster Rev.* Ap. 1865, p. 192.

III. Integrity. — Certain portions of this Gospel have been regarded as interpolations or later additions, even by those who accept the Gospel as a whole as the work of John. One of these is the closing part of verse 2, from ἐκδεχομένων, and the whole of ver. 4, in regard to which the critical authorities fluctuate, and which contain statements that give a legendary aspect to the narrative, such as belongs to no other of the miracles related in the Gospels. Both are rejected by Tischendorf, but retained by Lachmann; and the same diversity of judgment appears among interpreters, some rejecting both passages (Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen), others retaining both (Buckner), others rejecting ver. 4, but retaining verse 2 (Ewald), while some leave the whole in doubt (De Wette).

Another doubtful portion is the section relating to the woman taken in adultery (7:53-8:11). This is regarded as an interpolation because of the deficiency of critical evidence in its favor (see Tischendorf or Alford, ad loc.), and because of reasons founded on the passage itself, viz. the apparently forced way in which it is connected with what precedes by means of 7:53; the interruption caused by it to the course of the narrative, the words in 8:12 being evidently in continuation of what precedes this section; the alleged going of Jesus to the Mount of Olives and return to Jerusalem, which would place this occurrence in the *last* residence of our Lord in Jerusalem (Luke 21:37); the absence of the characteristic usage of the οὐν, which John so constantly introduces into his narratives, and for which we have in this section δέ, used as John generally uses ο ν; and the presence of the expressions ὄρθρον, πᾶς ὁ λαός καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς, οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι, ἐπιμένειν, ἀναμάρτητος, καταλείπεσθαι and κατακρίνειν, which are foreign to John's style. On the other side, it is urged that the section contains, as Calvin says, "Nihil apostolico spiritu indignum," that it has no appearance of a later legend, but bears every trace of an original account-of a very probable fact, and that it has a considerable amount of diplomatic evidence in its favor. The question is one which hardly admits of a decided answer. The preponderance of evidence is, undoubtedly against the Johannean origin of the section, and it has consequently been regarded as an interpolation by the great majority of critics and interpreters, including among the latter Calvin, Beza, Tittmann, Tholuck, Olshausen, Lücke, and Luthardt, as well as Grotius, De Wette, Paulus, and Ewald. At the same time, if it did not

form part of the original Gospel, it is difficult to account for its being at so early a period inserted in it. From a passage in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 3, 39) some have concluded that Papias inserted it from the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but it is not certain that it is to this section that the words of Eusebius refer, nor is it certain that he meant to say that Papias inserted the story he refers to in the Gospel. *SEE ADULTERY*, vol. 1, p. 87.

More important than either of these portions is ~~chap.~~ chap. 21, which is by many regarded as the addition of a later hand after the apostle's death. This opinion rests wholly on internal grounds, for there is no evidence that the Gospel was ever known in the Church without this chapter. At first sight it certainly appears as if the original work ended with ch. 20 and that ch. 21 was a later addition, but whether by the apostle himself or by some other is open to question. The absence of any trace of the Gospel having ever existed without it must be allowed to afford strong *prima facie* evidence of its having been added by the author himself; still this is not conclusive, for the addition may have been made by one of his friends or disciples before the work was in circulation. Grotius, who thinks it was made by the elders at Ephesus, argues against its genuineness, especially from ver. 24; but, though the language there has certainly the *appearance* of being rather that of others than that of the party himself to whom it refers, still it is not impossible that John may have referred to himself in the third person, as he does, for instance, in ~~19:35~~ 19:35; and as for the use of the pl. οἶδαμεν, that may be accounted for by his tacitly joining his readers with himself, just as he assumes their presence in 19:35. There is more difficulty in accepting ver. 25 as genuine, for such a hyperbolic mode of expression does not seem to comport with the simplicity and sincerity of John; but there seems to be no valid reason for calling into doubt any other part of the chapter.

IV. Design. — At the close of the Gospel the apostle has himself stated his design in writing it thus: “These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through his name” (~~20:31~~ 20:31). Taken in the general, this may be said to be the design of all the evangelical narratives, for all of them are intended to produce the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah promised to the fathers, and so to exhibit him in his saving power that men believing on him might enjoy that life which he had come to bestow. We must seek, therefore, John's specific design either in some special occasion which he sought to meet, or in some peculiarity in his mode of presenting the claims of Jesus, by which not merely his Messiahship should be evinced, but the

higher aspect of his person, and the spiritual effects of his working, should be prominently exhibited. Probably both of these concurred in the apostle's design; and we shall best conceive his purpose by neither, on the one hand, ascribing to him a merely historical, nor, on the other, a purely dogmatical design. It is an old and still prevalent opinion that John wrote his Gospel to supply the omissions of the other three; but no such impression is conveyed by the Gospel itself, which is as far as possible from having the appearance of a mere series of supplemental notes to previously existing writings; indeed, if this had been the apostle's purpose, it cannot be said that he has in any adequate way fulfilled it. Nor is there any ground for believing that it was a *polemical* object which chiefly prompted him to write this Gospel, though such a suggestion has often been made. Thus Irenaeus (*Hoer.* 3, 11, 1) says that the Gospel was written against the errors of Cerinthus. Jerome (*De vir. Illust.* 9) adds the Ebionites, and later writers have maintained that the Gnostics or the Docetae are the parties against whom the polemic of the apostle is here directed. All this, however, is mere supposition. Doubtless in what John has written there is that which furnishes a full refutation of all Ebionitish, Gnostic, and Docetic heresy; but that to confute these was the *design* of the apostle, as these writers affirm, cannot be proved. *SEE Gnostics*. At the same time, though he may have had no intention of formally confuting any existing heresy, it is more than probable that he was stimulated to seek by means of this record to counteract certain tendencies which he saw rising in the Church, and by which the followers of Christ might be seduced from that simple faith in him by which alone the true life could be enjoyed. Still this must be regarded, at the utmost, as furnishing only the occasion, not the design, of his writing. The latter is to be sought in the effect which this Gospel is fitted to produce on the mind of the reader in regard to the claims of Jesus as the divine Redeemer, the source of light and life to darkened and perishing humanity. With this view John presents him to us as he tabernacled among men, and especially as he taught when occasion called forth the deeper revelations which he, as the Word who had come forth from the invisible God to reveal unto men the Father, had to communicate. John's main design is a theological one; a conviction of which doubtless led to his receiving in the primitive Church the title *κατ' ἐξοχήν* of *Θεόλογος*. But the historical character of his writing must also be acknowledged. As one who had been privileged to "company" with Jesus, he seeks to present him to us as he really appeared among men, in very deed a partaker of their nature, yet, under that nature, veiling a higher, which ever and anon broke forth in manifestation, so that

those around him “beheld his glory as the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father” (~~John~~ John 1:14). “There is here no history of Jesus and his teaching after the manner of the other evangelists; but there is, in historical form, a representation of the Christian faith, in relation to the person of Christ, as its central point, and in this representation there is a picture, on the one hand, of the antagonism of the world to the truth revealed in him, and on the other of the spiritual blessedness of the few who yield themselves to him as the Light of Life” (Reuss, *Gesch. der Heil. Sch. d. N.T.* p. 204). As John doubtless had the other Gospels before him, without formally designing to supplement them, he would naturally enlarge more particularly upon those portions which they had left untouched, or passed over more briefly.

IV. Contents. — The Gospel begins with a prologue, in which the author presents the great theme of which his subsequent narrative is to furnish the detailed illustration — “the theological program of his history,” as one has called it, and which another has compared to the overture of a musical composition in which the leading idea of the piece is expressed (~~John~~ John 1:1-5). The historical exposition begins with verse 6, and the rest of the book may be divided into two parts. Of these the former (~~John~~ John 1:6-7) contains the account of our Lord’s public ministry from his introduction to it by John the Baptist and his solemn consecration to it by God, to its close in the Passion Week. In this portion we have the Savior presented to us chiefly in his manifestation to the world as a teacher sent from God, whose mission is authenticated by signs and wonders, and whose doctrines, truly divine, transcend in their spiritual import the narrow limits of human speculation, and can be comprehended only by a spiritual discernment. The second portion (~~ch.~~ ch. 13-21) may be divided into two parts, the one of which is introductory to the other. The former (ch. 13-17) presents to us our Lord in the retirement of private life, in his intercourse with his immediate followers, to whom he pours out his soul in loving counsel, warning, and promise, in the prospect of his departure from them; and in communion with his heavenly Father, with whom, as one who had finished the work he had received to do, he intercedes for those whose redemption from sin and evil is the coveted recompense of his obedience. To this succeeds the account of the Passion, and the appearances of Christ to his disciples after his resurrection (~~ch.~~ ch. 18-21), which forms the other part of the second portion of the book. See the minute analysis of Lampe in his

Comment., and a briefer one in Westcott, *Introd. to Study of the Gospels*, p. 281 sq.

The greater part of the book is occupied with the discourses of our Lord, the plan of the evangelist being obviously to bring the reader as much as possible into personal contact with Jesus, and to make the latter his own expositor. Regarding the discourses thus reported, the question has arisen, How far are they to be accepted as an exact report of what Jesus uttered? and in reply to this, three opinions have been advanced:

- 1.** That both in substance and in form we have them as they came from the lips of Christ;
- 2.** That in substance they present what Christ uttered, but that the form in which they appear is due to the evangelist; and,
- 3.** That they are not the discourses of Christ in any proper sense, but only speeches put in his mouth by the evangelist to express what the latter conceived to be a just representation of his doctrine. Of these views the last has found adherents only among a few of the skeptical school; it is without the slightest authority from the book itself, is irreconcilable with the simplicity and earnestness of the writer, is foreign to the habits and notions of the class to which the evangelist belongs, and is contradicted by the frequent explanations which he introduces of the sense in which he understood what he reports (comp. ^{<R21>}John 2:19, 21 7:38, 39; 12:32, 33, etc.), by the brief notices, which evince an actual reminiscence of the scenes and circumstances amid which the discourse was delivered (e.g. ^{<R43>}John 14:31), and by the prophetic announcements of his impending sufferings and death ascribed to the Savior, which are couched in language such as he might naturally use, such as accounts for those to whom he spoke, even his disciples, not understanding his meaning, but such as it is utterly incredible that one not desirous of reporting his very words should, writing after the fulfilment of these predictions, impute to him (comp. ^{<R73>}John 7:33-36; 8:21, 22; 10:17-20; 12:23-36; 14:1-4, 18, 28; 16:16, 19, etc.). Some of these considerations are of weight also as against the second of the opinions above stated; for, if John sought merely to give the substance of the Savior's teaching in his own words, why clothe predictions, the meaning of which at the time of his writing he perfectly understood, in obscure and difficult phraseology? Why especially impute to the speaker language of which he feels it necessary to give an explanation, instead of at once putting the intelligible statement in his discourse?

Undoubtedly the impression which one gets from the narrative is that John means the discourses he ascribes to Jesus to be received as faithful reports of what he actually uttered; and this is confirmed when one compares his report of John the Baptist's sayings with those of our Lord, the character of the one being totally different from that of the other. To this view it has been objected that there is such an identity of style in the discourses which John ascribes to Christ with his own style, both in this Gospel and in his Epistles, as betrays in the former the hand, not of a faithful reporter, but of one who gives in the manner natural to himself the substance of what his Master taught. In this there is some force, which is but partially met by the suggestion that John was so imbued with the very mind and soul of Christ, so informed by his doctrine, and so filled by his spirit, that his own manner of thought and utterance became the same as that of Christ, and he insensibly wrote and spoke in the style of his Lord. Reuss objects to this that on this supposition the style of Jesus "must have been a very uniform and sharply defined one, and such as excludes the very different style ascribed to him by the synoptists" (*Gesch. der H.S. des N.T.* p. 203). But the facts here are overstated; the style of our Lord's discourses in John is by no means perfectly uniform, nor is it much further removed from that ascribed to him by the synoptists than the difference of subject and circumstance will suffice to account for. As for the objection that it is inconceivable that the evangelist could have retained for so many years a faithful recollection of discourses heard by him only once, we need not, in order to meet it, resort to the foolish suggestion of Bertholdt that he had taken notes of them at the time for his own behoof; nor need we to lay stress on the assurance of Christ which John records that the Holy Ghost whom the Father should send to them would teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them (~~John~~ John 14:26), though to the believer this is a fact of the utmost importance. It will suffice to meet the objection if we suggest that, as the apostle went forth to the world as a witness for Christ, he did not wait till he sat down to write his Gospel to give forth his recollections of his Master's words and deeds. What he narrates here in writing is only what he must have been repeating constantly during his whole apostolic career. Still, after due allowance has been made for all these considerations, it must yet be admitted that the decided Johannean cast of all these discourses, as compared with our Lord's sayings reported in the synoptical Gospels, shows that while the evangelist gives the substance and essential form of Christ's public utterances, he nevertheless, to a large degree, molds them

into his own style of phraseology and coherence. This is especially true of ^{<B124>}John 12:44-50, which is evidently a summary of statements made on perhaps more than one occasion not definitely given. Indeed, it is doubtful if any of the evangelists give us the exact words of our Lord, as they certainly do not tally in this particular any more than they do in the order and connection in which these are narrated. (See Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte* [2d edit.], p. 314 sq.). *SEE HARMONIES.*

V. Characteristics. —

1. As to matter, the peculiarities of John's Gospel more especially consist in the four following doctrines:

- (1.) The mystical relation of the Son to the Father.
- (2.) That of the Redeemer to believers.
- (3.) The announcement of the Holy Ghost as the Comforter.
- (4.) The peculiar importance ascribed to love.

Yet these peculiarities are not confined to this Gospel. Although there can be shown in the writings of the other evangelists some isolated dicta of the Lord which seem to bear the impress of John, it can also be shown that they contain thoughts not originating with that disciple, but with the Lord himself. Matthew (^{<A127>}Matthew 11:27) speaks of the relation of the Son to the Father so entirely in the style of John that persons not sufficiently versed in Holy Writ are apt to search for this passage in the Gospel of John. The mystical union of the Son with believers is expressed in ^{<A180>}Matthew 28:20. The promise of the effusion of the Holy Ghost in order to perfect the disciples is found in ^{<A244>}Luke 24:49. The doctrine of Paul with respect to love, in ^{<A301>}1 Corinthians 13 entirely resembles what, according to John, Christ taught on the same subject. Paul here deserves our particular attention. In the writings of Paul are found Christian truths which have their points of coalescence only in John, viz., that Christ is *the image of the invisible God*, by whom all things are created (^{<S015>}Colossians 1:15, 16). Paul considers the Spirit of God in the Church *the spiritual Christ*, as Jesus himself does (^{<A146>}John 14:16), frequently using the words *εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ*.

2. As to form, there is something peculiar in the evangelist's manner of writing. His language betrays traces of that Hebraistic character which belongs generally to the N.T. writers, and the author shows his Jewish descent by various incidental indications; but he writes purer Greek than most of the others, and his freedom from Judaic narrowness is so marked that some have founded on this an argument against the genuineness of the book, forgetting that the experiences of the apostle in his more advanced years would materially tend to correct the prejudices and party leanings of his earlier career. The apostle's style is marked by ease, simplicity, and vividness; his sentences are linked together rather by inner affinity in the thoughts than by outward forms of composition or dialectic concatenation they move on one after the other, generally with the help of an **οὐ**, sometimes of a **καί**, and occasionally of a **δέ**, and favorite terms or phrases are repeated without regard to rhetorical art. The author wrote evidently for Hellenistic readers, but he makes no attempt at Greek elegance, or that wisdom of words which with many in his day constituted the perfection of Greek art. One of the peculiarities of John is that, in speaking of the adversaries of Jesus, he always calls them **οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι**. The simplicity of John's character is also evinced by the repetition of certain leading thoughts, reproduced in the same words both in the Gospel and in the Epistles, such as **μαρτυρία**, *testimony*; **δόξα**, *glory*; **ἀλήθεια**, *truth*; **φῶς**, *light*; **σκοτός**, *darkness*; **ζωὴ αἰώνιος**, *eternal life*; **μένειν**, *to abide*. — Kitto. See Kaiser, *De speciali Joan. Grammatica*, etc. (Erlang. 1842); Westcott, *Introd. to Study of the Gospels*, ch. 5.

VI. Place of Writing. — Ephesus and Patmos are the two places mentioned by early writers, and the weight of evidence seems to preponderate in favor of Ephesus. Irenaeus (3:1; also *apud* Euseb. *H.E.* 5, 8) states that John published his Gospel whilst he dwelt in Ephesus of Asia. Jerome (*Prol. in Matthew*) states that John was in Asia when he complied with the request of the bishops of Asia and others to write more profoundly concerning the divinity of Christ. Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Prol. in Joannem*) relates that John was living at Ephesus when he was moved by his disciples to write his Gospel.

The evidence in favor of Patmos comes from two anonymous writers. The author of the *Synopsis of Scripture*, printed in the works of Athanasius, states that the Gospel was dictated by John in Patmos, and published afterwards in Ephesus. The author of the work *De XII Apostolis*, printed in the Appendix to Fabricius' *Hippolytus* (p. 952 [ed. Migne]), states that

John was banished by Domitian to Patmos, where he wrote his Gospel. The later date of these unknown writers, and the seeming inconsistency of their testimony with John's declaration (~~and~~ Revelation 1:2) in Patmos, that he had previously borne record of the Word of God, render their testimony of little weight.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, Ephesus probably became the center of the active life of Eastern Christendom. Even Antioch, the original source of missions to the Gentiles, and the future metropolis of the Christian patriarch, appears, for a time, less conspicuous in the obscurity of early Church history than Ephesus, to which Paul inscribed his Epistle, and in which John found a dwelling place and a tomb. This half Greek, half Oriental city, "visited by ships from all parts of the Mediterranean, and united by great roads with the markets of the interior, was the common meeting place of various characters and classes of men" (Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, ch. 14). It contained a large church of faithful Christians, a multitude of zealous Jews, an indigenous population devoted to the worship of a strange idol, whose image (Jerome, *Proef. in Ephes.*) was borrowed from the East, its name from the West — in the Xystus of Ephesus free thinking philosophers of all nations disputed over their favorite tenets (Justin, *Trypho*, 1, 7). It was the place to which Cerinthus chose to bring the doctrines which he devised or learned at Alexandria (Neander, *Church History*, 1, 396 [Torrey's trans.]). In this city, and among the lawless heathens in its neighborhood (Clem. Alexan. *Quis dives salv.* § 42), John was engaged in extending the Christian Church when, for the greater edification of that Church, his Gospel was written. It was obviously addressed primarily to Christians, not to heathens. **SEE EPHESUS.**

VII. Date of Writing. — Attempts have been made to elicit from the language of the Gospel itself some argument which should decide the question whether it was written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem; but, considering that the present tense "is" is used in ~~and~~ John 5:2, and the past tense "was" in ~~and~~ John 11:18; 18:1; 19:41, it would seem reasonable to conclude that these passages throw no light upon the question.

Clement of Alexandria (*apud* Eusebius, *H.E.* 6, 14) speaks of John as the latest of the evangelists. The apostle's sojourn at Ephesus probably began after Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians was written, i.e. after A.D. 56.

Eusebius (*H.E.* 3, 20) specifies the fourteenth year of Domitian, i.e. A.D. 95, as the year of his banishment to Patmos. Probably the date of the Gospel may lie between these two, about A.D. 90. The references to it in the 1st Epistle and the Revelation lead to the supposition that it was written somewhat before those two books, and the tradition of its supplementary character would lead us to place it some considerable time after the apostle had fixed his abode at Ephesus.

VIII. *Commentaries.* — The following are the separate exegetical helps on the whole of John's Gospel exclusively (including the principal monographs on its special features), to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk [*]: Origen, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* 4, 1; also Berlin, 1831, 3 vols. 12mo); Jerome, *Expositio* (in *Opp. Suppos.* 11, 77, 773); Augustine, *Tractatus* (in *Opp.* 4, 385; translated, *Homilies* [includ. 1st Ep.], Oxford, 1848-9, 2 vols. 8vo); Chrysostom, *Homilioe* (in *Opp.* 5-3, 1; transl. *Homilies*, Oxf. 1848-52, 2 vols. 8vo); also *Interpretatio* (in Canisius, 1, 217); Nonnus, *Metaphrases* (Gr. and Lat. in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 9, 437; also ed. Heinsius, L.B. 1627, 8vo, 1639, fol.; also ed. Passovius, Lips. 1833, 8vo); Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 4, 1-1123); Bede, in *Joann.* (in *Opp.* 5, 451); Alcuin, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 1, 2, 457; also August. 1527, 8vo); Hugo a St. Victor, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 1, 233); Aquinas, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 5); also *Catena* (in *Opp.* 3; transl. as vol. 4 of "Catena Aurea," Oxford, 1845, 8vo); Bonaventura, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 2, 313); also *Collationes* (*ib.* 2, 467); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 11); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 4, 283); Melancthon, *Enarrationes* (Vitemb. 1523, fol.; also in *Opp.*); Bucer, *Enarrationes* (Argent. 1528, 8vo); OEcolampadius, *Adnotationes* (Basil. 1533, 8vo); Ferus [Rom. Catholic], *Enarrationes* (Mogunt. 1536, 1550, fol., Par. 1552, 1569, Lugd. 1553, 1558, 1563, Lovan. 1559, 8vo; ed. Medina, Complut. 1569, 1578, Mogunt. 1572, Rome, 1578, folio); Sarcer, *Scholia* (Basil. 1540, 8vo); Cruciger, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1540, Argent. 1546, 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1543, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1545, 1553, 1554, 1564, 1580, 1618, fol.); Guillaud, *Enarrationes* (Par. 1550, fol.; Lugd. 1555, 8vo); Alesius, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1553, 8vo); Calvin, *Commentarii* (Genev. 1553, 1555, fol.; also in *Opp.*; with a *harmony*, Genev. 1563; in French, *ib.* 1563; in English, by Feterston, London, 1584, 4to; by Pringle, Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); Traheron, *Exposition* [on part] (London, 1558, 8vo); De Reyna, *Annotationes* (Francof. 1573, 4to); Marloratus, *Exposition* (from the Latin, by Timme,

Lond. 1575, fol.); Aretius, *Commentarius* (Lausanne, 1578, 8vo); Danaeus, *Commentarius* (Geneva, 1585, 8vo); Hunnius, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1585, 1591, 1595, 8vo); Delphinus, *Commentarii* [includ. Hebrews] (ed. Sernanus, Rome, 1587, 8vo); Chytraeus, *Scholia* (ed. Schincke, F. ad M. 1588, 8vo); *Toletus [Rom. Cath.]; *Commentarii* (Rom, 1588, fol. 1590, 2 vols. 4to; Lugd. 1589, 1614, fol.; Ven. 1589, Brix. 1603, 4to); Hemmingius, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1591, fol.); Zepper, *Analysis* (Herb. 1595, 8vo); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1599, 1618, 8vo); Agricola, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1599, 8vo); Capponus, *Commentarius* (Ven. 1604, 4to); Pererius, *Disputationes* (Lugd. 160810), 2 vols. 4to); Pelargus, *Quoesita* (Francof. 1615, 4to); De Ribera, *Commentarius* (Lugdun. 1623, 4to); Mylius, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1624, 4to); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1629, 4to); Jansonius, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1630, 8vo); Corderius, *Catena* (Antw. 1630, folio); Lenaeus, *Commentarius* (Holm. 1640, 4to); Gomarus, *Illustratio* (Amst. 1644, fol.; also in *Opp.*); Lyser, *Disputationes* (Vitemb. 1646, 4to); Virginius, *Notoe* (Dorp, 1647, 4to); Amyraut, *Paraphrase* (Fr., Salm. 1651, 8vo); Petrus, *Arend*, etc. (Dutch. Amsterd. 1653, 3 vols. 4to); Schlichting, *Commentaria* [including other books of the N.T.] (Irenop. 1656, fol.); Hutcheson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1657, fol., 1840, 8vo); Nifanius, *Commentarius* (F. ad M. 1684, 4to); S. Schmidt, *Paraphrasis* (Argent. 1685, 1689, 4to; also in Germ., Hal. 1716, 8vo); Vassor, *Paraphrase* (Fr., Paris, 1689, 12mo); Comazzi, *Dimonstrazione*, etc. (Naples, 1706, 8vo); Sibersma, *Explication* (in French, Amst. 1717, 4to; in Germ., Basel, 1718, 4to); Guillaers, *Adnotationes* [includ. begin. of Matthew and Luke] (Gandav. 1724, 4to); *Lampe, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1724-6, Basil, 1725-7, 3 vols. 4to; in German, Lpz. 1729, 4to); also *Syntagma* (Amst. 1737, 2 vols. 4to); Merrick, *Annotations* [on 1-3] (Lond. 1764-7, 2 vols. 8vo); Lightfoot, *Exercitationes* (in *Works*, 12); also *Chorographia* (in Ugolino, *Thesaurus*, 5, 1117); Semler, *Paraphrasis* (Halle, 1771-2, 2 vols. 8vo); Mosheim, *Erklärung* (ed. Jacobi, Weim. 1777, 4to); Hezel, *Anleitung* (pt. 1, Frkft. 1792, 8vo); Oertel, *Erläut.* [includ. Epistles] (Frkft. and Gorl. 1795, 2 vols. 8vo); Morus, *Recitationes* (edit. Dindorf, Prag. 1795, Lips. 1796, 1808, 1821, 8vo); S. Lange, *Erklärung* [including Epistles] (Weimar, 1795-7, 3 vols. 8vo); Shepherd, *Notes* [including Epistles] (Lond. 1796, 4to); Schmid, *Theologia*, etc. (Jen. 1800, 8vo); Schulze, *Charakter*, etc. (Lpz. 1803 8vo); Paulus, *Commentar* (pt. 1, Tübing. 1806, 8vo); Breitenstein, *Anmerkungen* (Frkft, 1813, 1823, 8vo); *Tittmann, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1816, 8vo; tr. in English, Edinb. 1844, 2 vols. 12mo);

Mayer, *Beiträge* (Lps. 1820, 8vo); *Lücke, *Commentar* [includ. Epistles] (Bonn, 1820-32, 1833-5, 1840-43, 3 vols. 8vo; vol. 3 [epistle] transl. into Eng., Edinb. 1837, 12mo); Moysey, *Lectures* (Oxf. 1821-23, 2 vols. 8vo); Pitman, *Lectures* [on 1-10] (Lond. 1822, 8vo) ; Seyffarth, *Specialcharakteristik*, etc. (Lpzg. 1823, 8vo);. *Tholuck, *Commentar* (Hamb. 1826, 1828, 1831, 1833; Lips. 1837, 1844; Gotha, 1857; in Engl. by Kaufman, Boston, 1836, 12mo; by Krauth, Phila. 1859, 8vo); Klee, *Commentar* (Mainz, 1829, 8vo); Fickenscher, *Auslegung* (Nürnb. 1831-33, 3 vols. 8vo); Grimm, *Christologia*, etc. (Lips. 1833, 8vo); Sumner, *Exposition* (Lond. 1835, 8vo); Matthai, *Auslegung* (vol. 1, Gott. 1837, 8vo); Slade, *Readings* (London, 1837, 1843, 12mo); Simson, *Theologica* etc. (Reg. 1839, 8vo); Fromann, *Lehrbegrif*; etc. (Leipzig, 1839, 8vo); Wirth, *Erklärung* (Ulm, 1839, 8vo); Patterson, *Lectures* [14-16] (London, 1840, 12mo); Anderson, *Exposition* (London, 1841, 2 vols. 12mo); Drummond, *Exposition* (Lond. 1841, 12mo); Herberden, *Reflections* (Lond, 1842, 12mo); Köstlin, *Lehrbegriff*, etc. (Berlin, 1843, 8vo); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Auslegung* [includ. Epistles] (Jen. 1843-5, 2 vols. 8vo); Jones, *Sermons* [13-17] (Oxf. 1844, 8vo); Aislabee, *Translation* (Lond. 1845, 12mo); Ford, *Illustration* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); Luthardt, *Eigenthümlichkeit*, etc. (Lpz. 1852-3, 2 vols. 8vo); Bouchier, *Exposition* (London, 1854, 12mo); Cumming, *Readings* (London, 1856, 8vo); Maurice, *Discourses* (Camb. 1857, 12mo); 5 Clergymen, *Revision* (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Reuss, *Introd.* (in his *Hist. de la theol. Chretienne* Strasb. 1860, 2, 272 sq.); Fawcett, *Exposition* (London, 1860, 8vo); *Ewald, *Erklärung* [includ. Epistles] (Gott. 1861 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); *Hengstenberg, *Erläuterung* (Berl. 1861-64, 3 vols., 1869, 2 vols. 8vo; tr. in English, Edinb. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Malan, *Notes* (Lond. 1862, 4to); Astié, *Explication* (Genève, 1862-4, 3 vols. 8vo); Klofutar, *Commentarius* (Vienna, 1863, 8vo); Brown, *Lectures* (Oxf. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo); Baumlein, *Commentar* (Stuttg. 1863, 8vo); Scholten, *Onderzock*. (Leyd. 1864 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); Godet. *Commentaire* (vol. 1, 1864, 8vo); Ryle, *Thoughts* (Lond. 1865-6, 2 vols. 8vo); Anon. *Erläuterung* (Berlin, 1866, 8vo); Von Burger, *Erklärung* (Nördl. 1867, 8vo); Roffhack, *Auslegung* (Leipzig, 1871, 2 vols. 8vo). **SEE GOSPELS.**

John, First Epistle Of,

the most important of the so called *catholic* or “general” Epistles, of which it is the fourth in order. **SEE BIBLE**, vol. 1, p. 800, col. 2.

I. Its Authenticity. — That this is the production of the same author as wrote the fourth Gospel is so manifest that it has universally been admitted (comp. Hauff, *Die Authentie u. der hohe Werth des Evang. Johan.* p. 137 sq.). The establishment of the genuineness of the one, therefore, involves the admission of that of the other. The evidence, however, in favor of the Epistle is sufficient to establish its claims, apart from its relation to the Gospel. See § 7, below.

1. External. — Eusebius informs us that Papias knew and made use of it (*H.E.* 3, 39); Polycarp quotes a passage (~~4~~4, 3) from it in his Epistle to the Philippians, ch. 7; Irenaeus uses it (comp. *Adv. Hoer.* 3, 15; 5, 8, with ~~1~~1 John 2:18; 4:1, 3; 5, 1); it is quoted or referred to by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 2, 389) and Tertullian (*Scorpiac.* c. 22; *Adv. Prax.* c. 15); and Eusebius assures us that it was universally and always acknowledged in the Church (*H.E.* 3, 25, 26). It is found in the Peshito and in all the ancient versions and is included in every catalog of the canonical books which has come down to us (Lardner, *Works*, 6, 584). In fact, the only persons who appear not to have recognized this Epistle are the ancient heretics, the Alogi and the Marcionites, the latter of whom were acquainted with none of the writings of John, and the former rejected them all, ascribing them to Cerinthus, not upon critical, but purely arbitrary and dogmatical grounds.

2. With this the *internal* evidence fully accords. The work is anonymous, but the apostle John is plainly indicated throughout as the writer. The author asserts that he had been an immediate disciple of Jesus, and that he testifies what he himself had seen and heard (~~1~~1 John 1, 1-4; 4:14), and this assumption is sustained throughout in a way so natural and unaffected that it would be doing violence to all probability to suppose that it could have been attained by one who felt that he was practicing in this a deliberate imposition. The circumstances also of the writer to which he alludes, the themes on which he chiefly dwells, and the spirit which his writing breathes, are all such as fall in with what we know of the apostle John and suggest him as the writer. If this be the work of a pretender, he has, as De Wette remarks (*Exeget. Hdb.*), “shown incredible subtlety in concealing the name of the apostle, while he has indirectly, and in a most simple natural way, indicated him as the writer.”

A few German theologians in our own times (Lange, *Schriften des Johan.* 3, 4 sq.; Cludius, *Uransichten des Christenth.* p. 52 sq.; Bretschneider,

Probabilia, p. 166 sq.; Zeller, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1845) have been the first critics to throw doubts on the genuineness of any of John's writings, and this altogether on internal grounds, but they have met with complete refutations from the pens of Bertholdt (6), Harmsen (*Authent. d. Schr. d. Evangel. Johan.*), and Lücke (*Commentar*, 3). See above. The only serious objections to the Epistles are those of Bretschneider, who has equally attacked the genuineness of the Gospel.

(1.) He maintains that the doctrine concerning the *Logos*, and the anti-docetic tendency of John's 1st Epistle, betray an author of the second century, whom he assumes to be John the Presbyter. But it is beyond all question, says Lücke (1. c.), that the *Logos* doctrine of John, substantially, although not fully developed, existed in the Jewish theological notions respecting the Son of God, and that we find it distinctly expressed, although in different words, in the Pauline representation of Christ's exalted dignity (compare ~~SOME~~ Colossians 1 with ~~SOME~~ Hebrews 1); that the rudiments of it appear in the literature of the Jews, canonical and apocryphal, Chaldaic and Alexandrians; that in the time of Christ it was considerably developed in the writings of Philo, and still more strongly in the fathers of the second century, who were so far from retaining the simple, Hebraizing, and canonical mode of expression peculiar to John that in them it had assumed a gnostically erudite form, although essentially identical. John intends by the *Word (Logos)* to express the divine nature of Christ, but the patristic logology attempts to determine the relation between the *Logos* and the invisible God on one side and the world on the other. The earliest fathers, as Justin Martyr and Tatian, while they make use of John's phraseology, further support their doctrines by ecclesiastical *tradition*, which, as Lücke observes, must have its root in doctrines that were known in the first century. But, from Theophilus of Antioch downwards, the fathers, mentioning John by name, expressly connect their elucidations with the canonical foundation in the Gospel of John, without the granting of which the language of Justin would be inexplicable (Olshausen, *On the Genuineness of the Four Gospels*, p. 306 sq.). Accordingly, adds Lücke, on this side, the authenticity of the Gospel and Epistle remains unassailable. *SEE LOGOS.*

(2.) On similar grounds may be refuted Bretschneider's arguments derived from the anti-docetic character of John's Epistle. It is true, docetism, or the idealistic philosophy, was not fully developed before the second century, but its germ existed before the time of Christ, as has been shown by

Mosheim, Walch, and Niemeyer. Traces of Jewish theology and Oriental theosophy having been applied to the Christian doctrine in the apostolic age are to be found in the Epistles of Paul, and it would be unaccountable to suppose that the fully developed docetism should have first made its appearance in the Epistles of Irenaeus and Polycarp. We have the authority of the former of these for the fact that Cerinthus taught the docetic heresy in the lifetime of John in the simple form in which it seems to be attacked in ^(~~GRH~~)1 John 4:1-3; 2:22; 2 John 7. *SEE DOCETAE.*

II. Integrity. — The genuineness of only two small portions of this writing have been called in question, viz., the words *ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει* (^(~~GRH~~)1 John 2; 23), and the words *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ Πατήρ ὁ Λόγος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυποῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ* (^(~~GRH~~)1 John 5, 7, 8). The former of these is omitted in the Text. Rec., and is printed in italics in the A.V. It is, however, supported by sufficient authority, and is inserted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Scholz, etc. The latter of these passages has given rise to a world-famous controversy, which can hardly be said to have yet ended (Orme, *Memoir of the Controversy respecting the Heavenly Witnesses* [Lond. 1830]). The prevailing judgment, however, of all critics and interpreters is that the passage is spurious (see Griesbach, *Append. ad N.T.* 2, 1-25; Tischendorf on the passage; Lücke, *Comment. on the Epistles of John*, in *Bib. Casbinet*, No. 15, etc.). *SEE WITNESSES, THE THREE HEAVENLY.*

III. Time and Place of writing the First Epistle. — On these points nothing certain can be determined.

1. It has been conjectured by many interpreters, ancient and modern, that it was written at the same place as the Gospel. The more ancient tradition places the writing of the Gospel at Ephesus and a less authentic report refers it to the island of Patmos. Hug (*Introd.*) infers, from the absence of writing materials (^(~~GRH~~)3 John 13), that all John's Epistles were composed at Patmos. The most probable opinion is that it was written somewhere in Asia Minor, in which was the ordinary residence of the apostle (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 23); perhaps, according to the tradition of the Greek Church, at Ephesus, but for this we have no historical warrant (Lücke, *Commentary*).

2. It is equally difficult to determine the time of the writing of this Epistle, although it was most probably posterior to the Gospel, which seems to be referred to in ¹John 1:4. Some are of opinion that the Epistle was an envelope or accompaniment to the Gospel, and that they were consequently written nearly simultaneously (Hug, *Introd.*). As, however, the period when the Gospel was written, according to the evidence of tradition and criticism, “fluctuates between the sixth and ninth decennium of the first century” (Lücke, *Commentary*), we are at a loss for data on which to found any probable hypothesis respecting the exact time of the writing of the Epistle; but that it was posterior to the Gospel is further rendered probable from the fact that it is formed on such a view of the person of Jesus as is found only in John’s Gospel and that it abounds in allusions to the speeches of Jesus as there recorded. Lücke concludes, from its resembling the Gospel in its apologetical and polemical allusions, that it indicates such a state of the Christian community as proves that it must be posterior even to the last Epistles of Paul and consequently that the ancient Church was justified in classing it among the catholic Epistles, which all bear this chronological character.

It has been argued by several, from ¹John 2:18 (ἔσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν), that the Epistle was written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, while others, founding their conjecture on the same passage, maintain the very reverse. Among the former are to be found the names of Hammond, Grotius, Calovius, Lange, and Hänlein, and among the latter those of Baronius, Basnage, Mill, and Le Clerc.

Equally unsatisfactory is the argument, in respect to the time when this Epistle was written, derived from its supposed senile tone; for, although the style is somewhat more tautological than the Gospel, this can be accounted for by its epistolary character, without ascribing it to the effects of senile forgetfulness. In fact, this character is altogether denied by some of the ablest critics. Still, from the patriarchal tone assumed in the Epistle, and the frequent use of the appellation “little children,” we may reasonably conclude that it was written in advanced age, perhaps not long after the Gospel, or about A.D. 92.

IV. *For whom written.* — The writer evidently had in his eye a circle of readers with whom he stood in close personal relation — Christians, apparently, who were living in the midst of idolaters (¹John 5, 21), and who were exposed to danger from false speculation and wrong methods of

presenting the truths of Christianity (^{<GNT>}1 John 2, 22-26; 4:1-3; 5, 1-6, etc.). If the Epistle was written by John at Ephesus, we may, from these circumstances, with much probability conclude that the Christians in that region were the parties for whose behoof it was first designed. Augustine (*Quoest. Evangel.* 2, 39) says it was addressed “ad Parthos,” and this inscription appears in several MSS. of the Vulgate, and has been defended by Grotius, Paulus, and others, as giving the real destination of the Epistle. John, however, had no relations with the Parthians that we know of, nor does a single ancient testimony confirm the statement of Augustine, except on the part of later writers of the Latin Church, who probably simply followed him. It has been suggested that, as the 2d Epistle is by some of the ancients described as *παρθέvous* (Clem. Alex. *Frag.*, edit. Potter, p. 1011), this may have been changed into *,πρὸς Πάρθους* and by mistake applied to the 1st Epistle (Whiston, *Comment. on the Cath. Epistles*; Hug, *Intro.* p. 464, Fosdick’s transl.). This is possible, but not very probable. The suggestion of Wegscheider, that “ad Parthos” is an error for “ad Sparsos,” an inscription which actually is found in several MSS. (Scholz, *Bibl. Krit. Reise*, p. 67), is ingenious and may be correct. If we are to understand the term *catholic*, as applied to this Epistle, in the sense of circular, we may naturally infer, from the absence of the *epistolary form*, that this was an encyclical letter addressed to several of John’s congregations and in all probability to the churches of the Apocalypse. See § 8, below. Lardner is clearly right when he says that it was primarily meant for the churches in Asia under John’s inspection, to whom he had already orally delivered his doctrine (^{<GNT>}1 John 1:3; 2:7). *SEE REVELATION.*

V. Character. — Though ranked among the catholic Epistles, this writing has not the form of an epistle in this respect it more resembles a free homily; still, in fact, it undoubtedly was sent as a letter to the persons for whose instruction it was designed. The general strain is admonitory and the author seems to have written as he would have spoken had those whom he addresses been present before him. One great thought pervades the book — the reality of Christ’s appearance in the flesh, and the all sufficiency of his doctrine for salvation — a salvation which manifests itself in holiness and love. But the author does not discuss these topics in any systematic or logical form; he rather allows his thoughts to flow out in succession as one suggests another and clothes them in simple and earnest words as they arise in his mind. Some have imputed a character of senility to the work on this

account, but without reason. Under a simple and inartificial exterior there lies deep thought and the book is pervaded by a suppressed intensity of feeling that recalls the youthful Boanerges in the aged apostle. The mighty power that is in it has drawn to it in all ages the reverence and love of the noblest minds, “especially of those who more particularly take up Christianity as a religion of love — a religion of the heart” (Lücke, *Int.* p. 55).

VI. Contents. — A strict analysis of this Epistle, therefore, seems hardly possible, as the writer does not appear to have been systematic in its plan, but rather to have written out of a full and loving heart. “He asserts the pre-existent glory and the real humanity of our Lord, in opposition to false teachers, and for the comfort of the Church (1 John 1:1-7). Then follows a statement of the sinfulness of man, and the propitiation of Christ, this propitiation being intended to stir us up to holiness and love (1 John 1:8; 2:17); Jesus and the Christ are asserted to be *one*, in opposition to the false teachers (1 John 1:18-29). The next chapter seems devoted to the singular love of God in adopting us to be his sons, with the happiness and the duties arising out of it, especially the duty of brotherly love (ch. 3). The following chapter is principally occupied with marks by which to distinguish the teaching of the Spirit of God from that of false teachers and of Antichrist, with repeated exhortations to ‘love as brethren’ (ch. 4). The apostle then shows the connection between faith, renewal, love to God and to the brethren, obedience, and victory over the world, and concludes with a brief summary of what had been already said (ch. 5)” (Fairbairn). See § 8, below.

VII. Relation to the Fourth Gospel. — The close affinity between this Epistle and John’s Gospel has already been alluded to. In style, in prevailing formula of expression, in spirit, and in thought, the two are identical. “It is evident that the writer of each had a similar class of opponents in his mind — those who, like the Docetae, denied the true humanity of Christ; those, again, who denied that the man Jesus was the Christ and Son of God; and those who, under pretence of being his disciples, were habitually living in violation of his commands. In both books is the same deeply loving and contemplative nature; in both, a heart completely imbued with the teaching of the Savior; in both, also, the same tendency to abhorrence of those who opposed his Lord. Remarkable, too (to use the words of Ebrard), is the similarity of the *circle of ideas* in both

writings. The notions, *light, life, darkness, truth, lie*, meet us in the Epistle with the same broad and deep meaning which they bear in the Gospel; so, also, the notions of *propitiation* (ἱλασμός), of doing righteousness, sin, or iniquity (ἁμαρτίαν, ἄνομίαν), and the sharply-presented antitheses of light and darkness, truth and lie, life and death, of loving and hating, the love of the Father and of the world, children of God and of the devil, spirit of truth and of error” (Fairbairn). Macknight, and, still more fully, De Wette, have drawn out a copious comparison of expressions common to the Gospel and Epistle.

This similarity has led to the suggestion that both, in a sense, form one whole, the Epistle being, according to some, a prolegomenon to the Gospel; according to others, its practical conclusion; and according to others, its commendatory accompaniment. The probability is that both were written at the same period of the author’s life, and that they both contain in writing what he had been accustomed to testify and teach during his apostolic ministry; but whether any closer relation than this exists between them must remain matter entirely of conjecture.

VIII. Design. — That the apostle sought to confirm the believers for whom he wrote in their attachment to Christianity as it had been delivered to them by the ambassadors of Christ is evident on the surface of the Epistle. It is clear, also, that he had in view certain false teachers by whose arts the Christians were in danger of being seduced from the faith of Jesus as the incarnate Son of God, and from that holy and loving course of conduct to which true faith in Jesus leads; but who these false teachers were, or to what school they belonged, is doubtful. It is an old opinion that they were Docetae (Tertullian, *De carne Christi*, 1, 24; Dionys. Al. ap. Eusebius, *H.E.* 7, 25), and to this many recent inquirers have given in their adherence. Lücke, who strenuously defends this view, attempts to show that Docetism was in vogue as early as the time of John by an appeal to the case of Cerinthus and to the references to Docetism in three of the epistles of Ignatius (*Ad Smyrn.* 2 sq.; *Ad Trall.* 10; *Ad Eph.* 7); but the doctrine of Cerinthus respecting the person of Jesus Christ was not Docetic in the proper sense, and the passages cited from Ignatius are all subject to the suspicion of being interpolations, as none of them are found in the Syriac recension. Lücke lays stress also on the words ἐν σαρκί ἐληλυθότα (ⲉⲛⲥⲁⲣⲕⲓ 4, 2; comp. ⲉⲛⲥⲁⲣⲕⲓ 2 John 7) as indicating an express antithesis to the doctrine of the Docetics that Christ had come only in appearance. It may be doubted, however, whether this means anything more than that Christ had

really come, the phrase ἐν σαρκὶ ἔλθειν being probably a familiar technicality for this among the Christians. It may be questioned, also, whether the passage should not be translated thus, “Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ having [who has] come in the flesh is of God,” rather than thus, “Every spirit which confesseth *that* Jesus Christ is come,” etc. (for ὁμολογεῖν with the accusative, see [John 9:22](#); [Acts 23:8](#); [Romans 10:9](#); [1 Timothy 6:12](#)), and in this case even the appearance of allusion to a contrary doctrine vanishes (see Bleek, *Einleit.* p. 593). It may be added that, had John intended to express a direct antithesis to Docetism, he would hardly have contented himself with merely using the words ἐν σαρκὶ ἔλθειν, for there is a sense in which even the Docetae would have admitted this.

The main object of the Epistle, therefore, does not appear to be simply that of opposing the errors of the Docetae (Schmidt, Bertholdt, Niemeyer), or of the Gnostics (Kleuker), or of the Nicolaitans (Macknight), or of the Cerinthians (Michaelis), or of all of them together (Townsend), or of the Sabians (Barkey, Storr, Keil), or of Judaizers (Löffler, Semler), or of apostates to Judaism (Lange, Eichhorn, Hänlein): the leading purpose of the apostle appears to be rather constructive than polemical. John is remarkable both in his history and in his writings for his abhorrence of false doctrine, but he does not attack error as a controversialist. He states the deep truth and lays down the deep moral teaching of Christianity, and in this way, rather than directly, condemns heresy. In the introduction ([1 John 1:1-4](#)) the apostle states the purpose of his Epistle. It is to declare the Word of life to those whom he is addressing, in order that he and they might be united in true communion with each other and with God the Father and his Son Jesus Christ. He at once begins to explain the nature and conditions of communion with God, and, being led on from this point into other topics, he twice brings himself back to the same subject. The first part of the Epistle may be considered to end at [1 John 2:28](#). The apostle begins afresh with the doctrine of sonship of communion at [1 John 2:29](#) and returns to the same theme at [1 John 4:7](#). His lesson throughout is, that the means of union with God are, on the part of Christ, his atoning blood ([1 John 1:7](#); [2:2](#); [3:5](#); [4:10](#), [14](#); [5:6](#)) and advocacy ([1 John 2:1](#)) — on the part of man, holiness ([1 John 1:6](#)), obedience ([1 John 2:3](#)), purity ([1 John 3:3](#)), faith ([1 John 3:23](#); [1 John 4:3](#); [1 John 5:5](#)), and, above all, love ([1 John 2:7](#); [1 John 3:14](#); [1 John 4:7](#); [1 John 5:1](#)). John is designated as the Apostle of Love and rightly; but it

should be even remembered that his “love” does not exclude or ignore but embraces both faith and obedience as constituent parts of itself. Indeed, Paul’s “faith that worketh by love,” and James’ “works that are the fruit of faith,” and John’s “love which springs from faith and produces obedience,” are all one and the same state of mind described according to the first, third, or second stage into which we are able to analyze the complex whole.

IX. Commentaries. — The special exegetical helps on the whole of the *three* epistles of John, besides those mentioned under the Gospel above, are the following, of which we designate the most important by prefixing an asterisk: Didymus, *In Ep. Jo.* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 5; also in *Bibl. Patr. Gall.* 6); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 5); Althamer, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1521, 1528, 8vo); Hemming, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1569, 8vo); Selnecker, *Homilioe* (Franc. 1580, 1597, 8vo); Danaeus, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1585, 8vo); Horne, *Expositio* [including Jude] (Brunsw. 1654, to); Rappolt, *Commentatio* (ed. Carpzov, Lips. 1687, and later, 4to); Creighton, *Ontleeding* (Franec. 1704, 4to); J. Lange, *Exegesis* (Hal. 1713, 4to; including Pet., ib. 1724, fol.); Rasmeyer, *Erklärung* (Hamb. 1717, 4to); Whiston, *Commentary* (Lond. 1719, 8vo); Tgilde, *Verklaaring* (Delph. 1736, 4to); Ruhlius, *Notoe* (Amst. 1739, 12mo); Benson, *Notes* (London, 1749, 4to; includ. other cath. ep., ib. 1756, 4to); Schirmer, *Erklärung* (Breslau. 1780, 8vo); Morus, *Proelectiones* (edit. Hempel, Lips. 1797, 8vo); Hawkins, *Commentary* (Halifax. 1808, 8vo); Jaspis, *Adnotatio* [includ. Rev.] (Lips. 1816, 1821, 8vo); Paulus, *Erklärung* (Heidelberg, 1829, 8vo); Bickersteth, *Exposition* [includ. Jude] (London, 1846, 12mo); Braune, *Auslegung* (Grim. 1847, 8vo); Mayer, *Commentar* (Wien, 1851, 8vo); Sander, *Commentar* (Elberf. 1851, 8vo); Besser, *Auslegung* (Halle, 1851, 1856, 1862, 12mo); *Düsterdieck, *Commentar* (Götting. 1852-56, 2 vols. 8vo); *Huther, in Meyer’s *Handbuch* (Getting. 1853, 1861, 8vo); *Maurice, *Lectures* (Cambr. 1857, 1867, 8vo).

On the *First Epistle* alone there are the following: Augustine, *Tractsatus* (in *Opp.* 4, 1091; tr. into French. Par. 1670, 12mo); Luther, *Commentarius* (ed. Neumann, Lips. 1708; ed. Bruns, Lub. 1797, 8vo; also in German, in *Werke*, Lpz. 11, 572; Halle, 9, 906); Ecolampadius, *Homilioe* (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 4, 585); Tyndale, *Expositions* (London, 1531, 8vo reprinted, in *Expositions*, ib. 1829, p. 145); Megander *Adnotationes* [includ. Hebrews] (Tigur. 1539, 8vo); Foleng, *Commentaria* (Venice, 1546, 8vo); Beurlinus, *Commentarius* (Tibing. 1571, 8vo);

Hunnius, *Enarratio* (F. ad M. 1586, 1592, 8vo); Hessels, *Commentarius* (Duaci, 1599, 8vo); Eckhard, *Disputationes* (Gies. 1609, 8vo); Socinus, *Commentarius* (Racov. 1614, 8vo; also in *Opp.* 1, 157); Egard, *Erklärung* (Gosl. 1628, 8vo); Cundisius, *Quoestiones* (Jena, 1648, 1698, 4to); Roberts, *Evidences*, etc. (Lond. 1649, 8vo); Mestrezat, *Exposition* (Fr., Genève, 1651, 2 vols. 12mo); Cotton, *Commentary* (Lond. 1656, fol.); Hardy, *Unfolding* [on 1-3] (Lond. 1656-9, 2 vols. 4to); *S. Schmid, *Commentarius* (F. et Lipsiae, 1687, 1707, 1736, 4to); Dorsche, *Disputationes* (Rostock, 1697, 4to); Spener, *Erklärung* (Halle, 1699, 1711, 4to); Zeller, *Predigten* (Lpz. 1709, 8vo); Marperger, *Auslegung* (Nürnb. 1710, 4to); Oporinus, *Liberatio* (Gitting. 1741, 4to); Freylinghausen, *Erklärung* (Halle, 1741, 8vo); Steinhof, *Erklärung* (Tübing. 1762, Hamb. 1848, 8vo); Carpzov, *Scholia* (Helmstadt, 1773, 4to); Semler, *Paraphrasis* (Riga, 1792, 12mo); Hesselgren, *Prolegomena* (Upsala, 1800, 8vo); Weber, *De authentia*, etc. (Halle 1823, 4to); Rickli, *Erklärung* (Luz. 1828, 8vo); Pierce, *Sermons* (Lond. 1835, 2 vols. 8vo); Johannsen, *Predigten* (Alton. 1838, 8vo); Paterson, *Commentary* (Lond. 1842, 18mo); Thomas, *Etudes*, etc. (Genesis 1849, 8vo); *Neander, *Erläuterung* (Berl. 1851, 8vo; tr. into Engl. by Mrs. Conant, N.Y. 1852, 12mo); Erdmann, *Argumentum*. etc. (Berol. 1855, 8vo); Graham, *Commentary* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Myrberg, *Commentarius* (Upsala, 1859, 8vo); Handcock, *Exposition* (Edinburgh, 1861, 8vo); Candlish, *Lectures* (Edinburgh, 1866, 8vo); Haupt, *Einleitung*, etc. (Colb. 1869, 8vo). **SEE EPISTLES (CATHOLIC).**

John, Second And Third Epistles Of.

The title *catholic* does not properly belong to the 2d and 3d Epistles. It became attached to them, although addressed to individuals, because they were of too little importance to be classed by themselves, and, so far as doctrine went, were regarded as appendices to the 1st Epistle.

I. Authorship. —

1. The *external* evidence for the genuineness of these two Epistles is less copious and decisive than that for the 1st Epistle. They are not in the Peshito version, which shows that at the time it was executed they were not recognized by the Syrian churches; and Eusebius places them among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* (*H.E.* 3, 25). **SEE ANTILEGOMENA.** The 11th verse of the 2d Epistle, however, is quoted by Irenaeus (*Hoer.* 1, 16, 3) as a

saying of John, the disciple of the Lord, meaning thereby, without doubt, the apostle. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 2), in referring to John's 1st Epistle, uses the words Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ, which shows that he was acquainted with at least two Epistles of John; there is extant, in a Latin translation, a commentary by him on the 2d Epistle; and, as Eusebius and Photius both attest that he wrote commentaries on all the seven catholic Epistles, it would appear that he must have known and acknowledged the 3d also. If the *Adumbrationes* are Clement's, he bears direct testimony to the 2d Epistle (*Adambr.* p. 1011, edit. Potter). Origen speaks of the apostle John having left a 2d and 3d Epistle, which, however, he adds, all did not accept as genuine (*In Joan.* ap. Eusebius, 6, 25). Dionysius of Alexandria (*ibid.* 7, 25) recognizes them as productions of the same John who wrote the Gospel and the 1st Epistle and so do all the later Alexandrian writers. Eusebius himself elsewhere refers to them (*Dem. Evang.* 3, 5) without hesitation as John's; and in the synod held at Carthage (A.D. 256), Aurelius, bishop of Chullabi, confirmed his vote by citing ~~2~~ John 10 sq. as the language of the apostle John (Cyprian, *Opp.* 2, 120, ed. Oberthür). Ephrem Syrus speaks of them in the same way in the fourth century. In the fifth century they are almost universally received. A homily, wrongly attributed to St. Chrysostom, declares them uncanonical. In the *Muratori Fragment*, which, however, in the part relating to the Epistles of John, is somewhat confused or apparently vitiated, there are at least two Epistles of John recognized, for the author uses the plural in mentioning John's Epistles. In all the later catalogs, with the exception of the *Iambics ad Seleucum*, they are inserted with the other canonical books of the N.T. There is thus a solid body of evidence in favor of the genuineness of these epistles. That they were not universally known and received is probably to be accounted for by their character as private letters to individuals, which would naturally be longer in coming under general recognition than such as were addressed to churches or the Christians of a district.

The only antagonistic testimony which has reached us from antiquity is that of Jerome, who says (*De vir. Illust.* 9, 18) that both epistles were commonly reputed to be the production, not of John the apostle, but of John the presbyter, confirmed by the statement of Eusebius (3, 25) that it was doubtful whether they were the production of the evangelist or of another John. On this it may be observed,

1. That the statement of Jerome is certainly not true in its full extent, for there is evidence enough that both in his own time and before, as well as after it, the general belief, both in the Latin and the Greek churches, was that they were written by John the apostle.
2. Both Jerome and Eusebius concur in attesting that *all* ascribed these Epistles either to John the apostle or John the presbyter as their author, which may be accepted as convincing evidence that they are not forgeries of an age later than that of the apostle.
3. The question being between John the apostle and John the presbyter, we may, without laying stress on the fact that the existence of the latter is, to say the least, involved in doubt, *SEE JOHN THE PRESBYTER*, call attention to the consideration that, while the use of the expression ὁ πρεσβύτερος by the writer of the 2d Epistle may have given rise to the report which Jerome and Eusebius attest, there lies in this a strong evidence that the writer was John the apostle, and not John the presbyter; for it is quite credible that the former, writing in his old age, should employ the term πρεσβύτερος to express this fact just as Paul does (Philemon 9), and as Peter does (1 Peter 5:1), whereas it is incredible that the latter, with whom presbyter was a title of office, should in writing a letter to an individual, designate himself thus, inasmuch as, the office being common to him with many others, the title, in the absence of his name, was no designation at all, to say nothing of the fact that there is no evidence that the members of the πρεσβυτήριον in the primitive churches ever received πρεσβυτερος as a title, any more than the members of the Church, though collectively οἱ ἅγιοι received individually ἅγιος or ἀδελφός as a title (see below). On these grounds there seems to be no reason for attaching much importance to the opinion or tradition reported by Jerome, though it has been adopted by Erasmus, Grotius, Credner, Jachmann (*Comm. üb. d. Kathol. Br.*), and more recently by Ebrard (Olshausen, *Comment.* 6, 4, E.T. vol. 10. and in Herzog, *Encyc.* 6, 736). A late writer (Willichen, *Der geschichtliche Charakter; des Ev. Joh.* Elberf. 1869) holds that the 2d and 3d Epistles are the production of disciples of John the apostle.
2. If the external testimony is not as decisive as we might wish, the *internal* evidence is peculiarly strong. Mill has pointed out that of the thirteen verses which compose the 2d Epistle, eight are to be found in the 1st Epistle. Either, then, the 2d Epistle proceeded from the same author as the 1st, or from a conscious fabricator who desired to pass off something of his

own as the production of the apostle; but, if the latter alternative had been true the fabricator in question would assuredly have assumed the title of John *the apostle* instead of merely designating himself as John *the elder*, and he would have introduced some doctrine which it would have been his object to make popular. The title and contents of the Epistle are strong arguments against a fabricator, whereas they would account for its nonuniversal reception in early times; and if not the work of a fabricator, it must, from style, diction, and tone of thought, be the work of the author of the 1st Epistle, and, we may add, of the Gospel. The private nature of their contents removes also the suspicion that they could have been forged, since it would be difficult to discover any purpose which could have led to such a forgery.

The reason why John designates himself as **πρεσβύτερος** rather than **ἀπόστολος** (**<6002>** John 1; **<6003>** John 1) is no doubt the same as that which made Peter designate himself by the same title (**<6001>** Peter 5:1), and which caused James and Jude to give themselves no other title than “the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (**<5000>** James 1:1), “the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James” (**<6000>** Jude 1). Paul had a special object in declaring himself an apostle. Those who belonged to the original Twelve had no such necessity imposed upon them. With them it was a matter of indifference whether they employed the name of apostle, like Peter (**<6001>** Peter 1:1; **<6002>** Peter 1:1), or adopted an appellation which they shared with others, like John, and James, and Jude. *SEE ELDER.*

II. The *second* Epistle is addressed to one whom the writer calls **ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία**. This has been differently understood. By some it has been regarded as designating the Church collectively, by others as designating a particular congregation, and by others as denoting an individual. This expression cannot mean the Church (Jerome), nor a particular church (Cassiodorus), nor the elect Church which comes together on Sundays (Michaelis), nor the Church of Philadelphia (Whiston), nor the Church of Jerusalem (Whitby). These opinions are rendered improbable partly by the reference in **<6011>** verse 11 to the *children*, and in verse 13 to the *sister* of the party addressed, partly by the want of any authority for such a usage of the term **κυρία** as would thus be imputed to the apostle. By those who understand this of an individual there are three renderings: according to one interpretation she is “the lady Electa;” to another, “the elect Kyria;” to a third, “the elect lady.” The first interpretation is that of Clement of Alexandria (if the passage above referred to in the *Adunbrationes* be his), Wetstein, Grotius,

Middleton; the second is that of Benson, Carpzov, Schleusner, Heumann, Bengel, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Lücke, Neander, Davidson; the third is the rendering of the English version, Mill, Wall, Wolf; Le Clerc, Lardner, Beza, Eichhorn, Newcome, Wakefield, Macknight. For the rendering “the lady Electa” to be right, the word **κυρία** must have preceded (as in modern Greek) the word **ἐκλεκτῆ**, not followed it; and, further, the last verse of the Epistle, in which her sister is also spoken of as **ἐκλεκτή**, is fatal to the hypothesis. The rendering “the elect lady” is probably wrong, because there is no article before the adjective **ἐκλεκτῆ**. It remains that the rendering “the elect Kyria” is probably right, though here too we should have expected the article — as, indeed, we should under any of the three renderings (though the rendering “an elect lady” is not demanded; see Alford, *Gr. Test.* vol. 5, prolegg.). The choice, therefore, being between the last two of these renderings, two circumstances seem to be decisive in favor of the former: Kyria occurs elsewhere as a proper name, **SEE CYRIA**; and that **ἐκλεκτή** is to be taken in its usual signification is rendered probable by its being applied in verse 13 to the sister of the party addressed. **SEE ELECTA**.

At the time of writing this Epistle the apostle was with the sister of the lady addressed, but expresses a hope ere long to see the latter, and converse with her on matters of which he could not then write. From this we may infer either that the apostle was at the time on a journey from which he expected ere long to return, or that the lady in question resided not very far from his usual residence, and that he intended soon to pay her a visit. Adopting the latter hypothesis as the more probable, and viewing it in connection with the apostle’s styling himself **πρεσβύτερος**, we may infer that the Epistle was written at a late period of the apostle’s life.

The object of the apostle in writing the 2d Epistle was to warn the lady to whom he wrote against abetting the teaching known as that of Basilides and his followers, by perhaps an undue kindness displayed by her towards the preachers of the false doctrine. After the introductory salutation, the apostle at once urges on his correspondent the great principle of love, which with him (as we have before seen) means right affection springing from right faith and issuing in right conduct. The immediate consequence of the possession of this love is the abhorrence of heretical misbelief, because the latter, being incompatible with right faith, is destructive of the producing cause of love and therefore of love itself. This is the secret of John’s strong denunciation of the “deceiver,” whom he designates as

“Antichrist.” Love is with him the essence of Christianity, but love can spring only from right faith. Wrong belief, therefore, destroys love, and with it Christianity. Therefore says he, “If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (~~6010~~2 John 10, 11).

III. The *third* Epistle is addressed to Caius, a Christian brother noted for his hospitality to the saints. Whether this be one of those mentioned elsewhere in the N.T. by this name is uncertain; he *may* have been the same mentioned ~~4928~~ Acts 19:28. *SEE GAIUS*. The apostle writes for the purpose of commending to the kindness and hospitality of Caius some Christians who were strangers in the place where he lived. It is probable that these Christians carried this letter with them to Caius as their introduction. It would appear that the object of the travellers was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles without money and without price (~~6007~~3 John 7). The apostle had already written to the ecclesiastical authorities of the place (ἐγράψα ~~6009~~ver. 9, not “scripsissem,” as the Vulg.), but they, at the instigation of Diotrephes, had refused to receive the missionary brethren, and therefore the apostle now commends them to the care of a layman. It is probable that Diotrephes was a leading presbyter who held Judaizing views, and would not give assistance to men who were going about with the purpose of preaching solely to the Gentiles. The apostle intimates the probability of his soon personally visiting the church, when he would deal with Diotrephes for his misconduct, and would communicate to Caius many things of which he could not then write. In the mean time he exhorts him to follow that which is good, commends one Demetrius, and concludes with benediction and salutation. Whether this Demetrius (~~6012~~ver. 12) was a tolerant presbyter of the same community, whose example John holds up as worthy of commendation in contradistinction to that of Diotrephes, or whether he was one of the strangers who bore the letter, we are now unable to determine.

From their general similarity, we may conjecture that the two epistles were written shortly after the 1st Epistle from Ephesus. They both apply to individual cases of conduct the principles which had been laid down in their fulness in the 1st Epistle.

IV. *Commentaries.* — The following are the exegetical helps on the whole of both the latter epistles exclusively, in addition to those noticed above:

Jones, *Commentary* [including Philem. etc.] (Lond. 1635, fol.); Smith, *Exposition* [on 2d Epistle] (Lond. 1663, 4to); Sonntag, *Hypomnemata* (Altorf, 1697, 8vo); Feustking, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Verpoorten, *Exercitationes* (Gedan. 1741, 4to); Heumann, *Commentar* [on 3d Epist.] (Helmst. 1778, 8vo); Müller, *Commentarius* [on 2d Epist.] (Schleiz, 1783, 4to); Sommel, *Isogoge* (Lond. 1798, 4to); Rambonnet, *Specimen*, etc. [on 2d Epistle] (Tr. ad Rh. 1818, 8vo); Gachon, *Authenticité*, etc. (Montaub. 1851, 8vo); Cox, *Private Letters of Sts. Paul and John* (Lond. 1867, 8vo). **SEE COMMENTARY.**

John, Revelation Of.

SEE REVELATION.

John The Baptist

(*Iῴαννης ὁ βαπτιστῆς* or simply *Iῴαννης*, when the reference is clear, as in ^{<410>}Matthew 3:4; 4:12; Lat. *Joannes* [Tacitus, *Hist.*, 5, 12]; Heb. ^{<410>}יְהוֹנָתָן denoting *grace*, or *favor* [see Simonis, *Lex. N.T.* p. 513]). In the Church John commonly bears the honorable title of “forerunner of the Lord” — antecursor et praeparator viarum Domini (Tertull. *ad. Marc.* 4, 33); in Greek, *πρόδρομος, προάγγελος Κυρίου*. The accounts of him which the Gospels present are fragmentary and imperfect; they involve, too, some difficulties which the learned have found it hard to remove; yet enough is given to show that he was a man of a lofty character and that the relation in which he stood to Christianity was one of great importance. Indeed, according to our Lord’s own testimony, he was a more honored character and distinguished saint than any prophet who had preceded him (^{<410>}Luke 7:28). **SEE PROPHET.**

1. John was of the priestly race by both parents, for his father Zacharias was himself a priest of the course of Abia, or Abijah (^{<1310>}1 Chronicles 24:10), offering incense at the very time when a son was promised to him; and Elizabeth was of the daughters of Aaron (^{<410>}Luke 1:5), the latter “a cousin” (*συγγενής* *relative*) of Mary, the mother of Jesus, whose senior John was by a period of six months (^{<410>}Luke 1). Both parents, too, were devout persons, walking in the commandments of God and waiting for the fulfillment of his promise to Israel. The divine mission of John was the subject of prophecy many centuries before his birth, for ^{<410>}Matthew 3:3 tells us that it was John who was prefigured by Isaiah as “the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths

straight” (^{<30B>}Isaiah 40:3), while by the prophet Malachi the Spirit announces more definitely, “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me” (^{<30B>}Isaiah 3:1). His birth — a birth not according to the ordinary laws of nature, but through the miraculous interposition of Almighty power — was foretold by an angel sent from God, who announced it as an occasion of joy and gladness to many, and at the same time assigned to him the name of *John*, to signify either that he was to be born of God’s especial favor, or, perhaps, that he was to be the harbinger of grace. The angel Gabriel, moreover, proclaimed the character and office of this wonderful child even before his conception, foretelling that he would be filled with the Holy Ghost from the first moment of his existence, and appear as the great reformer of his countrymen — another Elijah in the boldness with which he would speak truth and rebuke vice — but, above all, as the chosen forerunner and herald of the long-expected Messiah. These marvellous revelations as to the character and career of the son for whom he had so long prayed in vain were too much for the faith of the aged Zacharias, and, when he sought some assurance of the certainty of the promised blessing, God gave it to him in a judgment — the privation of speech — until the event foretold should happen — a judgment intended to serve at once as a token of God’s truth and a rebuke of his own incredulity. And now the Lord’s gracious promise tarried not. Elizabeth, for greater privacy, retired into the hill country, whither she was soon afterwards followed by her kinswoman Mary, who was herself the object and channel of divine grace beyond measure greater and more mysterious. The two cousins, who were thus honored above all the mothers of Israel, came together in a remote city, and immediately God’s purpose was confirmed to them by a miraculous sign; for, as soon as Elizabeth heard the salutations of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb, thus acknowledging, as it were, even before birth, the presence of his Lord (^{<30B>}Luke 1:43, 44). Three months after this, and while Mary still remained with her, Elizabeth was delivered of a son, B.C. 6. The exact spot where John was born is not determined. The rabbins (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 324; Witsii *Miscell. Sacr.* 2, 389) fix on Hebron, in the hill country of Judaea; Paulus, Kuinoel, and Meyer, after Reland, are in favor of Jutta, “a city of Juda.” **SEE JUTTAH.** On the eighth day the child of promise was, in conformity with the law of Moses (^{<30B>}Leviticus 12:3), brought to the priest for circumcision, and, as the performance of this rite was the accustomed time for naming a child, the friends of the family proposed to call him Zacharias, after the name of his father. The mother, however, required that he should be called John, a

decision which Zacharias, still speechless, confirmed by writing on a tablet, “his name is John.” The judgment on his want of faith was then at once withdrawn, and the first use which he made of his recovered speech was to praise Jehovah for his faithfulness and mercy (~~416~~ Luke 1:64). God’s wonderful interposition in the birth of John had impressed the minds of many with a certain solemn awe and expectation (~~415~~ Luke 3:15). God was surely again visiting his people. His providence, so long hidden, seemed once more about to manifest itself. The child thus supernaturally born must doubtless be commissioned to perform some important part in the history of the chosen people. Could it be the Messiah? Could it be Elijah? Was the era of their old prophets about to be restored? With such grave thoughts were the minds of the people occupied as they mused on the events which had been passing under their eyes, and said one to another, “What manner of child shall this be?” while Zacharias himself, “filled with the Holy Ghost,” broke forth in a glorious strain of praise and prophecy — a strain in which it is to be observed that the father, before speaking of his own child, blesses God for remembering his covenant and promise in the redemption and salvation of his people through him of whom his own son was the prophet and forerunner. A single verse contains all that we know of John’s history for a space of thirty years, the whole period which elapsed between his birth and the commencement of his public ministry: “The child grew and waxed strong in the spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel” (~~418~~ Luke 1:80). John it will be remembered, was ordained to be a Nazarite (see ~~400~~ Numbers 6:1-21) from his birth, for the words of the angel were, “He shall drink neither wine nor strong drink” (~~415~~ Luke 1:15). What we are to understand by this brief announcement is probably this: the chosen forerunner of the Messiah and herald of his kingdom was required to forego the ordinary pleasures and indulgences of the world, and live a life of the strictest self-denial in retirement and solitude. The apocryphal *Protev. Jac.* ch. 22, states that his mother, in order to rescue her son from the murder of the children at Bethlehem which Herod commanded, fled with him into the desert. She could find no place of refuge, the mountain opened at her request and gave the needed shelter in its bosom. Zacharias, being questioned by Herod as to where his son was to be found, and refusing to answer, was slain by the tyrant. At a later period Elizabeth died, when angels took the youth under their care (Fabricius, *Cod. Apocryph.* p. 117 sq.; comp. Kuhn, *Leben Jesu*, 1, 163, remark 4). It was thus that the holy Nazarite, dwelling by himself in the wild and thinly-peopled region westward of the Dead Sea, called “desert”

in the text, prepared himself by self-discipline, and by constant communion with God, for the wonderful office to which he had been divinely called. Here year after year of his stern probation passed by, till the time for the fulfilment of his mission arrived. The very appearance of the holy Baptist was of itself a lesson to his countrymen; his dress was that of the old prophets — a garment woven of camel's hair (^{<1008>}2 Kings 1:8), attached to the body by a leathern girdle. His food was such as the desert spontaneously afforded — locusts (^{<8122>}Leviticus 11:22) and wild honey (^{<8116>}Psalms 81:16) from the rock. (See Endemann, *De victu Jo. Bapt.* Hersfeld, 1752; Thadd. a St. Adamo, *De victu Joa. Bapt. in deserto*, Bonn, 1785; Müller, *Varia de victu Joa. Baptist.* Bonn, 1829; Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 96.) Desert though the place is designated, the country where he spent these early years — the wild mountainous tract of Judah lying between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea, along which it stretches — was not entirely destitute of means for supporting human existence (^{<4101>}Matthew 3:1-12; ^{<41001>}Mark 1:1-8; ^{<41010>}Luke 3:1-20; ^{<41018>}John 10:28; Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 88). Josephus, in his *Life* (2, 2), gives an account of one of his instructors, Banus, which throws light on John's condition in the desert: "He lived in the desert, and had no other food than what grew of its own accord, and bathed himself in cold water frequently, both by night and by day. I imitated him in these things, and continued with him three years." Some writers infer that John was an *Essene*; so says, e.g. Taylor, editor of Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible*; comp. Johnson, *Monks before Christ* (Bost. 1870, 12mo), p. 109 sq. But this is denied by Rénan, *Vie de Jesus* (13th ed. Paris, 1867), p. 101 sq.

2. At length, in the fifteenth year of the associate reign of the emperor Tiberius (see Jarvis, *Chronicles Introd.* p. 228 sq., 462 sq.), or A.D. 25, the long-secluded hermit came forth to the discharge of his office. His supernatural birth, his hard ascetic life, his reputation for extraordinary sanctity, and the generally-prevailing expectation that some great one was about to appear — these causes, without the aid of miraculous power, for "John did no miracle" (^{<41041>}John 10:41), were sufficient to attract to him a great multitude from "every quarter" (^{<41035>}Matthew 3:5). Brief and startling was his first exhortation to them — "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." A few scores of verses contain all that is recorded of John's preaching, and the sum of it all is repentance — not mere legal ablution or expiation, but a change of heart and life. Herein John, though exhibiting a marked contrast to the scribes and Pharisees of his own time, was but

repeating, with the stimulus of a new and powerful motive, the lessons which had been again and again impressed upon them by their ancient prophets (comp. ^{<2016>}Isaiah 1:16, 17; 55: 7, ^{<2008>}Jeremiah 7:3-7; ^{<2689>}Ezekiel 18:19-32 36:25-27, ^{<2012>}Joel 2:12, 13 ^{<3008>}Micah 6:8; ^{<3008>}Zechariah 1:3, 4). But, while such was his solemn admonition to the multitude at large, he adopted towards the leading sects of the Jews a severer tone, denouncing Pharisees and Sadducees alike as “a generation of vipers,” and warning them of the folly of trusting to external privileges as descendants of Abraham (^{<4088>}Luke 3:8). Now at last, he warns them that “the axe was laid to the root of the tree,” that formal righteousness would be tolerated no longer, and that none would be acknowledged for children of Abraham but such as did the works of Abraham (comp. ^{<4089>}John 8:39). Such alarming declarations produced their effect and many of every class pressed forward to confess their sins and to be baptized.

What, then, was the baptism which John administered? *SEE WASHING*. (Comp. Olshausen, *Comment.* ad loc. Job.; Dale, *Johannic Baptism*, Phila. 1871.) Not altogether a new rite, for it was the custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes to their religion; not an ordinance in itself conveying remission of sins, but rather a token and symbol of that repentance which was an indispensable condition of forgiveness through him whom John pointed out as “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world.” Still less did the baptism of John impart the grace of regeneration of a new spiritual life (^{<4008>}Acts 19:3, 4). This was to be the mysterious effect of baptism “with the Holy Ghost,” which was to be ordained by that “mightier one” whose coming he proclaimed. The preparatory baptism of John was a visible sign to the people, and a distinct acknowledgment by them that a hearty renunciation of sin and a real amendment of life were necessary for admission into the kingdom of heaven, which the Baptist proclaimed to be at hand. But the fundamental distinction between John’s baptism unto repentance and that baptism accompanied with the gift of the Holy Spirit which our Lord afterwards ordained is clearly marked by John himself (^{<4081>}Matthew 3:11, 12). *SEE BAPTISM OF JOHN*. As a preacher, John was eminently practical and discriminating. Self love and covetousness were the prevalent sins of the people at large on them, therefore, he enjoined charity and consideration for others. The publicans he cautioned against extortion, the soldiers against violence and plunder. His answers to them are, no doubt, to be regarded as instances of the appropriate warning and advice which he addressed to every class. The first reason assigned by

John for entering on his most weighty and perilous office was announced in these words: “The kingdom of heaven is at hand.” It was his great work to prepare the mind of the nation, so that when Jesus himself came they might be a people made ready for the Lord. What was the exact idea which John intended to convey by the term “kingdom of heaven” it is not easy, at least in the space before us, to determine with satisfaction. (See Richter. *De munere sacro Joanni Bapt. divinitus delegato*, Lips. 1756.) We feel ourselves, however, justified in protesting against the practice of those who take the vulgar Jewish notion and ascribe it to John, while some go so far as to deny that our Lord himself, at the first, possessed any other. Had we space to develop the moral character of John, we could show that this fine, stern, high-minded teacher possessed many eminent qualities; but his personal and official modesty in keeping, in all circumstances, in the lower rank assigned him by God must not pass without special mention. The doctrine and manner of life of John appear to have roused the entire of the south of Palestine, and people flocked from all parts to the spot where, on the banks of the Jordan, he baptized thousands unto repentance. Such, indeed, was the fame which he had gained, that “people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not” (^{<40B>}Luke 3:15). Had he chosen, John might without doubt have assumed to himself the higher office, and risen to great worldly power; but he was faithful to his trust, and never failed to declare, in the fullest and clearest manner, that he was not the Christ, but merely his harbinger, and that the sole work he had to do was to usher in the day spring from on high. (See Beecher, *Life of Jesus*, vol. 1, ch. 5.)

The more than prophetic fame of the Baptist reached the ears of Jesus in his Nazarene dwelling, far distant from the locality of John (^{<40B>}Matthew 2:9, 11). The nature of the report — namely, that his divinely-predicted forerunner had appeared in Judaea — showed our Lord that the time had now come for his being made manifest to Israel. The mission of the baptist — an extraordinary one for an extraordinary purpose — was not limited to those who had openly forsaken the covenant of God, and so forfeited its principles; it was to the whole people alike. This we must infer from the baptism of one who had no confession to make, and no sins to wash away. Jesus himself came from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of John, on the special ground that it became him “to fulfil all righteousness,” and, as man, to submit to the customs and ordinances which were binding upon the rest of the Jewish people. John, however, naturally at first shrank from offering

the symbols of purity to the sinless Son of God. Immediately on the termination of this symbolical act, a divine attestation was given from the opened vault of heaven, declaring Jesus to be in truth the long looked-for Messiah — "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (^{<A1B7>}Matthew 3:17). The events which are found recorded in ^{<B19>}John 1:19 sq. seem to have happened after the baptism of Jesus by John. *SEE JESUS CHRIST.*

Here a difficult question arises — How is John's acknowledgment of Jesus at the moment of his presenting himself for baptism compatible with his subsequent assertion that he knew him not save by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, which took place after his baptism? It is difficult to imagine that the two cousins did not personally recognize each other, from their close relationship, and the account which John could not have failed to receive of the remarkable circumstances attending Jesus' birth; hence his general deference at that time, but his explicit testimony subsequently (see Kuinol, Alford, *Comment.* on ^{<A1B4>}Matthew 3:14). The supposition that John was not personally acquainted with Jesus is therefore out of the question (see Lücke, *Comment.* on ^{<B13>}John 1:31). Yet it must be borne in mind that their places of residence were at the two extremities of the country, with but little means of communication between them. Perhaps, too, John's special destination and mode of life may have kept him from the stated festivals of his countrymen at Jerusalem. It is possible, therefore, that the Savior and the Baptist had not often met. It was certainly of the utmost importance that there should be no suspicion of concert or collusion between them. John, however, must assuredly have been in daily expectation of Christ's manifestation to Israel, and so a word or sign would have sufficed to reveal to him the person and presence of our Lord, though we may well suppose such a fact to be made known by a direct communication from God, as in the case of Simeon (^{<A26>}Luke 2:26; comp. Jackson *on the Creed*, Works. Oxf. ed. 6, 404). At all events, it is wholly inconceivable that John should have been permitted to baptize the Son of God without being enabled to distinguish him from any of the ordinary multitude. Upon the whole, the true meaning of the words **καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν** would seem to be as follows: And I, even I, though standing in so near a relation to him, both personally and ministerially, had no assured knowledge of him *as the Messiah*. I did not know him, and I had not authority to proclaim him as such till I saw the predicted sign in the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him. It must be borne in mind that John had

no means of knowing by previous announcement whether this wonderful acknowledgment of the divine Son would be vouchsafed to his forerunner at his baptism or at any other time (see Dr. Mill's *Hist. Character of St. Luke's Gospel*, and the authorities quoted by him). **SEE BAPTISM OF JESUS.**

With the baptism of Jesus John's more especial office ceased. The king had come to his kingdom. The function of the herald was discharged. It was this that John had with singular humility and self-renunciation announced beforehand: "He must increase, but I must decrease." It seems but natural to think, therefore, when their hitherto relative position is taken into account, that John would forthwith lay down his office of harbinger, which, now that the Sun of Righteousness himself had appeared, was entirely fulfilled and terminated. Such a step he does not appear to have taken. From incidental notices we learn that John and his disciples continued to baptize some time after our Lord entered upon his ministry (see ^{<4183>}John 3:23; 4:1). We gather also that John instructed his disciples in certain moral and religious duties, as fasting (^{<4194>}Matthew 9:14; ^{<4163>}Luke 5:33) and prayer (^{<4210>}Luke 11:1). In short, the language of Scripture seems to imply that the Baptist Church continued side by side with the Messianic (^{<4113>}Matthew 11:3; ^{<4179>}Luke 7:19; ^{<4125>}John 14:25), and remained long after John's execution (^{<4483>}Acts 19:3). Indeed, a sect which bears the name of "John's disciples" exists to the present day in the East, whose sacred books are said to be pervaded by a Gnostic leaven. (See Gesenius, in the *Allgem. Literaturzeitung*, 1817, No. 48, p. 378, and in the *Hall. Encyclop.*, probeheft, p. 95 sq.; Burckhardt, *Les Nazoréens apellés Zaebiens et Chrétiens de St. Jean, secte Gnostique*, Strasb. 1810; also Blarkey, in the *Bibl. Hag.* 4, 355 sq.; Schaff, *Apost. Hist.* p. 279 sq.). **SEE JOHN, ST., CHRISTIANS OF.** They are hostile alike to Judaism and Christianity, and their John and Jesus are altogether different from the characters bearing these names in our evangelists. Still, though it has been generally assumed that John did not lay down his office, we are not satisfied that the New Testament establishes this alleged fact. John may have ceased to execute his own peculiar work as the forerunner, but may justifiably have continued to bear his most important testimony to the Messiahship of Christ; or he may even have altogether given up the duties of active life some time, at least, before his death; and yet his disciples, both before and after that event, may have maintained their individuality as a religious communion. Nor will the student of the New Testament and of ecclesiastical history,

who knows how grossly a teacher far greater than John was, both during his life and after his crucifixion, misunderstood and misrepresented, think it impossible that some misconception or some sinister motive may have had weight in preventing the Baptist Church from dissolving and passing into that of Christ. (See Weber, *J. d. Täufer und die Parteien seiner Zeit*, Gotha, 1870.) It was, not improbably, with a view to remove some error of this kind that John sent the embassy of his disciples to Jesus which is recorded in ~~<1118>~~ Matthew 11:3; ~~<1179>~~ Luke 7:19. The spiritual course which the teachings of Jesus were more and more taking, and the apparent failure, or at least uneasy postponement of the promised kingdom in the popular sense, especially after their esteemed master lay in prison, and was in imminent danger of losing his life, may well have led John's disciples to doubt if Jesus were in truth the expected Messiah; but no intimation is found in the record that *John* required evidence to give him satisfaction. (See below.) Be that as it may, it is certain that John still continued to present himself to his countrymen in the capacity of *witness* to Jesus. Especially did he bear testimony to him at Bethany beyond Jordan (for Bethany, not Bethabara, is the reading of the best MSS.). So confidently, indeed, did he point out the Lamb of God, on whom he had seen the Spirit alighting like a dove, that two of his own disciples, Andrew, and probably John, being convinced by his testimony, followed Jesus as the true Messiah.

3. But shortly after he had given his testimony to the Messiah, John's public ministry was brought to a close. He had, at the beginning of it, condemned the hypocrisy and worldliness of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and he had now occasion to denounce the lust of a king. In daring disregard of the divine laws, Herod Antipas had taken to himself the wife of his brother Philip; and when John reproved him for this, as well as for other sins (~~<1189>~~ Luke 3:19), Herod cast him into prison. Josephus, however, assigns a somewhat different cause for Herod's act from that given in the Gospels: "Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment of what he did against John that was called the Baptist; for Herod slew him, although he was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness one towards another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. Now when others came in crowds about him — for they were greatly moved by hearing his words — Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion (for they seemed ready to do anything he

should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Machaerus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death" (*Ant.* 18, 5, 2). There is no contrariety between this account and that which is given in the New Testament. (See Lamy, *Diss. de vinculis Joa. Bapt.*; Van Til, *De Joa. Bapt. incarcerationis fictitia Herodiana vincula antecedente*, L.B. 1710.) Both may be true: John was condemned in the mind of Herod on political grounds, as endangering his position, and executed on private and ostensible grounds, in order to gratify a malicious but powerful woman. The scriptural reason was but the pretext for carrying into effect the determination of Herod's cabinet. That the fear of Herod was not without some ground may be seen in the popularity which John had gained (⁴¹¹¹²Mark 11:32; see Lardner, *Works*, 6, 483).

The castle of Machaerus, where John was imprisoned and beheaded, was a fortress lying on the southern extremity of Peraea, at the head of the Lake Asphaltites, between the dominions of Herod and Aretas, king of Arabia Petraea, and at the time of our history appears to have belonged to the former (Lardner, 6, 483). It was here that the above-mentioned reports reached him of the miracles which our Lord was working in Judaea — miracles which, doubtless, were to John's mind but the confirmation of what he expected to hear as to the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. But if Christ's kingdom were indeed established, it was the duty of John's own disciples, no less than of all others, to acknowledge it. They, however, would naturally cling to their own master, and be slow to transfer their allegiance to another. With a view, therefore, to overcome their scruples, John sent two of them to Jesus himself to ask the question, "Art thou he that should come?" They were answered not by words, but by a series of miracles wrought before their eyes — the very miracles which prophecy had specified as the distinguishing credentials of the Messiah (²³⁸¹⁵Isaiah 35:5; 61:1); and while Jesus bade the two messengers carry back to John as his only answer the report of what they had seen and heard, he took occasion to guard the multitude who surrounded him against supposing that the Baptist himself was shaken in mind, by a direct appeal to their own knowledge of his life and character. Well might they be appealed to as witnesses that the stern prophet of the wilderness was no waverer, bending to every breeze, like the reeds on the banks of Jordan. Proof abundant had

they that John was no worldling, with a heart set upon rich clothing and dainty fare — the luxuries of a king’s court — and they must have been ready to acknowledge that one so inured to a life of hardness and privation was not likely to be affected by the ordinary terrors of a prison. But our Lord not only vindicates his forerunner from any suspicion of inconstancy, he goes on to proclaim him a prophet, and more than a prophet; nay, inferior to none born of woman, though in respect to spiritual privileges behind the least of those who were to be born of the Spirit and admitted into the fellowship of Christ’s body (~~Q111~~ Matthew 11:11). It should be noted that the expression ὁ δὲ μικρότερος, κ. τ. λ., is understood by Chrysostom, Augustine, Hilary, and some modern commentators to mean Christ himself, but this interpretation is less agreeable to the spirit and tone of our Lord’s discourse. Jesus further proceeds to declare that John was, according to the true meaning of the prophecy, the Elijah of the new covenant, foretold by Malachi (~~Q101~~ Malachi 3:4).

The event, indeed, proved that John was to Herod what Elijah had been to Ahab, and a prison was deemed too light a punishment for his boldness in asserting God’s law before the face of a king and a queen. Nothing but the death of the Baptist would satisfy the resentment of Herodias. Though foiled once, she continued to watch her opportunity, which at length arrived. A court festival was kept in honor of the king’s birthday. After supper the daughter of Herodias, came in and danced before the company, and so charmed was the king by her grace that he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask. Salome, prompted by her abandoned mother, demanded the head of John the Baptist. The promise had been given in the hearing of his distinguished guests, and so Herod, though loath to be made the instrument of so bloody a work, gave instructions to an officer of his guard, who went and executed John in the prison, and his head was brought to feast the eyes of the adulteress whose sins he had denounced. *SEE HERODIAS*. According to the Scripture account, the daughter of Herodias obtained the Baptist’s head at the entertainment, without delay. How could this be when Machaerus lay at a distance from Jerusalem? The feast seems to have been made at Machaerus, which, besides being a stronghold, was also a palace, built by Herod the Great, and here Antipas appears to have been spending some time with his paramour Herodias.

4. Thus was John added to that glorious army of martyrs who have suffered for righteousness’ sake. His death seems to have occurred just

before the third Passover, in the course of the Lord's ministry, A.D. 28. Herod undoubtedly looked upon him as some extraordinary person, for no sooner did he hear of the miracles of Jesus than, though a Sadducee himself, and, as such, a disbeliever in the resurrection, he ascribed them to John, whom he supposed to have risen from the dead. *SEE HEROD ANTIPAS*. Holy Scripture tells us that the body of the Baptist was laid in the tomb by his disciples, and ecclesiastical history records the honors which successive generations paid to his memory. He is mentioned in the Koran, with much honor, under the name of *Jahja* (see Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, p. 144-149, Tigur. 1660; Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.* 2, 283 sq.).

The brief history of John's life is marked throughout with the characteristic graces of self-denial, humility, and holy courage. So great, indeed, was his abstinence that worldly men considered him possessed. "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they said he hath a devil." His humility was such that he had again and again to disavow the character and decline the honors which an admiring multitude almost forced upon him. To their questions he answered plainly he was not the Christ, nor the Elijah of whom they were thinking, nor one of their old prophets. He was no one — a voice merely — the voice of God calling his people to repentance in preparation for the coming of him whose shoe latchet he was not worthy to unloose. For his boldness in speaking truth, he went a willing victim to prison and to death.

Resembling, though John did, in so many things the Elijah of former days, the exit of the one from his field of labor was remarkable for its humiliating circumstances, as the other for its singular glory — the one dying as a felon by the hand of the executioner, the other, without tasting at all of death, ascending to heaven in a chariot of fire. But in John's case it could not be otherwise; the forerunner, no more than the disciple, could be above his Master; and especially in the treatment of the one must the followers of Jesus be prepared for what was going to be accomplished in the other. After John's death, and growing out of it, a whole series of special actions and discourses were directed to this end by our Lord. The manner of John's death, therefore, is on no account to be regarded as throning a depreciatory reflection on his position and ministry. He was, as Christ himself testified, "a burning and a shining light" (~~John~~ John 5:35), and he fulfilled his arduous course in a truly noble and valiant spirit. — Fairbairn.

5. For the literature connected with this subject, see, besides the treatises noticed above, — Hase, *Leben Jesu* (4th ed. Leipzig, 1854), p. 82, 86,

149; Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 20 sq., 23, 125; Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, 3, 402; Witsii *Exerc. de Joanne Bapt.* (in his *Miscell. Sacra*, 2, 367); Leopold, *Johannes der Täufer* (Hannov. 1825); Usteri, *Nachrichten von Johannes dem Täufer* (in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1829, 3:439); Von Rohden, *Johannes der Täufer* (Lübeck, 1838); Neander, *Leb. Jesu* (Hamb. 1837), p. 49; Keim, *Leb. Jesu*, 1, 469-523; Hausrath, *Leben Jesu*, p. 316-340. The ecclesiastical traditions touching John may be found in the *Acta Sanct.* 4, 687-846; and, in a compendious form, in Tillemont. *Mémoires*, 1, 82-108, 482-505. Other treatises of a more special character, in addition to those above cited, are: Hottinger, *Pentas dissert. Bibl. chronol.* (Traj. a. R. 1723) p. 143 sq.; Deyling, *Observationes sacr.* 3, 251 sq.; Ammon, *Pr. de doctrina et morte Jo. Bapt.* (Erlangen; 1809); Rau, *Pr. de Joan. Bapt. in rem Christ. studiis* (Frlang. 1785), 2, 4; Abegg, *Orat. de Jo. Bapt.* (Heidelb. 1820); Bax, *Specim. de Jo. Bapt.* (L. B. 1821); Stein, *Ueb. Gesch. Lehre u. Schicksale Joh. d. T.* (in Keil's *Analect.* 4, 1, 37 sq.); Wessenberg, *Johannes der Vorläufer uns. Herrn* (Constanz, 1821); Müller, *Pr. de Jo. Bapt.* (Helmst. 1733); Asp. *Obs. Phil. hist. de Jo. Bapt.* (Upsala, 1733) Lisco, *Biblische Beitr. über J. d. Täufer* (Berlin, 1826); Eckhard, *Josephus de Jo. Bapt. testatus* (Eisen. 1785); Harenberg, *De cibo Jo. Bapt.* (in *Otia Gand. sacra*, Traj. ad R. 1740, p. 1 sq.); Amnele, *Amictus et victus J. Bpt.* (Upsal. 1755); Stollberg, *id.* (Vitemb. 1673); Carpzov, *De cultu Jo. B. Antiquat. Chr.* (Rome, 1755); Huth, *Num. Jo. B. Maria et discip. Chr. fuerint baptizati* (Erlangen, 1759); Blatt, *A Dissert. on John's Message to our Savior* (London, 1789); Zeigermann, *Comm. de consil. quo Jo. discip. ad Jesum ablegaverit* (Nuremb. 1813); Frank, *Joh. d. Täufer* (Eisleben, 1841); Kromayer, *De baptismo Christi* (Lips. 1680).

John, Aegēates

(**οἈἰγεᾶτης**), a presbyter of Ægae (**Αἰγαί**) (probably in Cilicia, between Mopsuestia and Issus). Photius calls him (*Cod.* 55) a Nestorian, but Fabricius, with reason, supposes that he was a Eutychian. When he flourished is not known; he may perhaps be consigned to the latter half of the 5th century. Vossius places him under Zeno the Isaurian, but Cave thinks he was later. He is the reputed author of

(1) **Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία** (*Historia Ecclesiastica*) in ten books, of which Photius had read five, containing the history of the Church from the deposition of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus (the third general

council, A. D. 431) to the deposition of Petrus Fullo (A.D. 477), who had usurped the see of Antioch in the reign of the emperor Zeno. As the Council of Ephesus is the point at which the ecclesiastical history of Socrates leaves off, it is probable that the history of John of Ægae commenced, like that of Evagrius, at that point, and consequently that these five books were the first five of his history. Photius describes his style as perspicuous and florid, and says that he was a great admirer of Dioscorus of Alexandria, the successor of Cyril, and extolled the Synod of Ephesus (A.D. 449), generally branded with the epithet ἡ ληστρική, “the synod of robbers,” while he attacked the Council of Chalcedon. How late a period the history came down to cannot be determined: —

(2) A work which Photius describes as *Κατὰ τῆς ἀγίας τετάρτης συνόδου* (*Adversus Quartam Sanctam Synodum*). This must be Photius’ description, not the original title of the work; for, opposed as we infer John to have been to the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, he would hardly have described it as “the fourth sacred council.” Photius commends the style in which the work was written. Fabricius identifies John of Ægae with the Joannes ὁ διακρινόμενος, i.e. “the dissenter,” cited by the anonymous writer of the *Διαστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικά* (*Breves Demonstrationes Chronographicoe*), given by Combefis (in his *Origenum C. Politinarum Manipulus*, p. 24, 33), but Combefis himself (*ibid.* p. 59) identifies this John with John Malalas. Whether John of Ægae is the John ὁ Πήτωρ, “the Rhetorician,” cited by Evagrius Scholasticus (*Hist. Eccl.* 1, 16; 2, 12; 3, 10, etc.) is doubtful. Le Quien (*Opera S. Joannis Damasceni*, 1, 368, note) identifies them, but Fabricius thinks they were different persons. See Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 41, 55; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 7, 419; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1, 456, ed. Oxford, 1740-43; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, 2, 585.

John Agricola.

SEE AGRICOLA.

John Alasco.

SEE LASCO.

John Of Alexandria.

SEE JOHN NICIOTA; SEE JOHN TALAIJA.

John Alexandrinus.

SEE JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

John The Almsgiver

(JOHANNES ELEEMOSYNARIUS), one of the best of the patriarchs of the Eastern Church, was born of noble parentage at Amanthus, in Cyprus, about 550. He had married young, but, losing his wife, he distributed his possessions among the poor, and devoted himself to a life of ascetic practices. So irreproachable was his conduct, and so great his reputation for piety and charity, that, on the murder of Theodore, he was unanimously demanded as successor in the patriarchate. He was appointed by the emperor in A.D. 606. The first years of his reign were quiet; not so the last years, which were marked by the successful invasions of Chosroes II, king of the Persians, during the reign of Phocas, into the Roman possessions of the Orient (compare Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire*, ch. 46). From all parts of Syria Christians fled to Alexandria to find a protector in John, and when at last Jerusalem also had fallen (A.D. 619), not content with feeding and clothing the refugees he found right at his own door, he sent large sums of money to the Holy City to redeem Christian captives and prevent further massacre. (The statement that at this fall of Jerusalem “90,000 Christians were massacred, and that principally by the Jews, who purchased them from the Persians on purpose to put them to death” [Neale], has no better basis than the inventions of prejudiced monastics, bent on the destruction of the Jews; Comp. Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 5, 34 sq., 438 sq.). In 620, when the Persians threatened Egypt also, he fled to his native island, and died there a short time after his arrival. He is commemorated in the Oriental Church November 11, and in the Latin January 23. Curiously enough, he is also commemorated by the Jacobites. It is from this John that the famous order of the *Hospitallers*, in the first instance, derived its name. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, ascribed to him the authorship of the celebrated *Epistola ad Coesarium*, with which most Protestant and some Roman Catholic critics credit Chrysostom. Three biographical accounts were written of him:

(1) by Joannes Moschus and Sophronius (no longer extant);

(2) by Leontius, bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus (translated, between 858 and 867, into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, and repeatedly printed); found in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists (Jan. 23, 2, 495);

(3) by Simeon Metaphrastes (but not trustworthy). See Neale, *Hist. East. Ch. (Alexandria)*, 2, 52 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 5, 718 sq.; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Groeca*, 1, 699, note 20; 8, 322; 10, 262. (J.H.W.)

John Of Antioch (1),

a prelate of the early Greek Church, distinguished for the part he took in the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, flourished in the first half of the 5th century, and succeeded Theodotus in the patriarchate of Antioch about A.D. 427. Favorably disposed towards Nestorius, who is said to have been a schoolmate of his in the monastery of St. Euprepus, near Antioch, he was forced to take decided ground against Cyril by the impolitic conduct of the latter at the Council of Ephesus (q.v.). Among the Eastern bishops who came with John of Antioch to attend the council, he was the acknowledged leader, and we need not wonder, therefore, that he swayed them all in favor of Nestorius, when, on arriving at Ephesus, they learned that the sessions had not only commenced, but that Nestorius had already been actually condemned without their sanction. As long as Irenaeus (q.v.) and Candidius succeeded in maintaining the Nestorians at the court of the emperor Theodosius, John proved faithful to his course taken at Ephesus; but when he found the Cyrillian party gaining the upper hand, he slowly modified his position until a reconciliation with Cyril followed (A.D. 432). He now turned actually against his former friend Nestorius, and after much trouble and opposition, which he vanquished, partly by persuasion, partly by deposing the pertinacious, the other Eastern bishops also — in provincial councils held at Antioch (A.D. 432), Anazarbus (A.D. 433), and Tarsus (A.D. 434) — declared for Cyril and the decrees of the third Ecumenical Council. Nay, it is said that John of Antioch was even the man who instigated the emperor to make the banishment of Nestorius perpetual; no doubt actuated by a desire to convince the Cyrillians of the truthfulness of his conversion. In the controversy with Theodore of Mopsuestia he took more liberal ground, declining, at a council held in 438, to condemn the writings and opinions of Theodore; according to Liberatus, he even appeared in his defense. John died in 441 or 442. He is spoken of by Gennadius (*De Viris Illustribus*, c. 54) as possessed of great rhetorical power. He wrote

(1) *Ἐπιστολαί* (*Epistoloe*) and *Ἀναφοραί* (*Relationes*) respecting the Nestorian controversy and the Council of Ephesus, of which several are contained in the various editions of the *Concilia*: —

(2) Ὁμιλία (*Homilia*), the homily or exhortation delivered at Chalcedon, just after the Council of Ephesus, to the people of Constantinople, with the aim to animate them to continue steadfast in their adherence to the old Nicene Confession; a fragment of it we have in the *Concilia*: —

(3) Περὶ τῶν Μεσαλιανιτῶν (*De Messalianis*), a letter to Nestorius, enumerated by Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 32) among the episcopal and synodical papers against that heretical body, contained in the history or acta of the Council of Side (A. D. 383): —

(4) *Contra eos qui una tantum substantia asserunt adorandum Christum* (only known to us by Gennadius; probably the work from which the passages are taken with which Eulogius credits John of Antioch). See Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 586 sq.; Tillemont, *Memoires*, vol. 14; Mansi, *Concilia*, 4, 1259 sq.; Neale, *Hist. East. Ch. (Alexandria)*, 1, bk. 2, sect. 2 and 3; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 2, 178 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist. Ai*, § 138-140; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 5, 224 sq.; Gibbon, *Decl. and Fall Rom. Emp.* ch. 47.

John Of Antioch (2),

surnamed *Codonatus*, the successor of Petrus Gnapheus, or Fullo (the Fuller), after his deposition, in the patriarchate of Antioch, A.D. 447. John had previously been bishop of Apamea; but, after holding the patriarchate three months, he was deposed by a synod of Eastern bishops, and succeeded by Stephen. Theophanes incorrectly places the appointment of John after Stephen's death. Both John and his predecessor Petrus had been, at the instigation of Acacius of Constantinople, excommunicated by the pope; yet, after the deposition of John, the same Acacius procured his elevation to the bishopric of Tyre. Theophanes incorrectly ascribes this appointment to Calendion of Antioch. See Theophanes, *Chronog.* p. 110, etc., ed. Paris (p. 88, etc., ed. Venice; p. 199, etc., ed. Bonn); Valesius, *Not. ad Evagrii H.E.* 3, 15, and *Observationes, Eccles. ad Evagrium*, 2, 8. — Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* 2, 586.

John Of Antioch (3),

surnamed *Scholasticus*, an eminent Greek legist, flourished in the 6th century. He entered the Church, and became patriarch of Constantinople (564-578). He compiled a collection of ecclesiastical laws, which greatly surpassed in extent and method those which preceded it, and which has

remained the basis of canon law in the Greek Church. Another of his works, entitled *Nomocanon*, was an attempt to harmonize Justinian's constitutions relating to the Church with the older rules. Both works were for many centuries held in high estimation, and were inserted in Voell and Justel's *Bibl. juris canonici veteris* (Paris, 1961), 2, 603-789. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Groeca*. 11, 100; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.* ^{<0135>}Genesis 26:530. (J.N.P.)

John Archaph

(Ἀρχάφ), an Egyptian schismatic of some note, was a contemporary of Athanasius. He was a devoted follower of Melitius, who, just before his death, which occurred shortly after his condemnation by the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), made John the Meletian bishop of Memphis, and intrusted to him also the leadership of the Melitian as a body. John, supported by the Arians, renewed the attacks against the orthodox party, and the schism soon became as violent as ever. Athanasius, now patriarch of Alexandria, and leader of the orthodox party, was the great object of attack; and John and his followers sought to throw on him the odium of originating the disturbances, and of persecuting his opponents; and, especially, they charged him with the murder of Arsenius, a Melitian bishop, whom they had secreted in order to give color to the charge. Athanasius (q.v.), on his part, appealed to the emperor, Constantine the Great, charging John and his followers with unsoundness in the faith, with a desire to alter the decrees of the Nicene Council, and with raising tumults and insulting the orthodox; he also objected to them as being irregularly ordained. He refuted their charges, especially the charge of murder, ascertaining that Arsenius was alive, and obliged them to remain quiet. John professed to repent of his disorderly proceedings and to be reconciled to Athanasius, and returned with his party into the communion of the orthodox Church, but the reconciliation was not sincere or lasting; troubles broke out again, and a fresh separation took place, John and his followers either being ejected from communion by the Athanasian party, or their return opposed. The Council of Tyre (A.D. 335), in which the opponents of Athanasius were triumphant, ordered them to be readmitted; but the emperor, deeming John to be a contentious man, or at least thinking that his presence was incompatible with the peace of the Egyptian Church, banished him (A.D. 336), just after he had banished Athanasius into Gaul. The place of his exile and his subsequent fate are not known — Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 2, 21, 22, 25, 31; Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos*, c. 65,

67, 70, 71; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. 6 passim, vol. 7 passim; Neale, *Hist. Eastern Ch. (Alexandria)* 1, 131; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog.* 2, 587.

John Argyropûlus

(Ἀργυροπούλος), one of the learned Greeks whose flight into Western Europe contributed so powerfully to the revival of learning, was born at Constantinople of a noble family, and was a presbyter of that city, on the capture of which (A.D. 1453) he is said by Fabricius and Cave to have fled into Italy; but there is every reason to believe that his removal was antecedent to that event, and that he was in Italy several times previously. A passage cited by Tiraboschi (*Storia della Lett. Italiana*, 6, 198) makes it likely that he was at Padua A.D. 1434, reading and explaining the works of Aristotle on natural philosophy. In A.D. 1439 an Argyropulus was present with the emperor John Palaeologus at the Council of Florence (Michael Ducas, *Hist. Byzant.* c. 31), and, though it is not certain that this was our John, it yet seems very probable. In A.D. 1441 he was at Constantinople, as appears from a letter of Francesco Filelfo to Pietro Perleoni (see Philelphus, *Epistol.* 3), engaged in public teaching, but it is uncertain how long he had been established there. Probably he had returned some time between A.D. 1434 and 1439, and accompanied Bessarion to and from the Council of Florence. Among his pupils at Constantinople was Michael Apostolius. During his abode in Italy, after his last removal thither in 1453, he was honorably received by Cosmo de' Medici, and was made preceptor to Lorenzo de' Medici, the celebrated son of Pietro, in Greek and in the Aristotelian philosophy, especially in ethics. When Lorenzo succeeded to the throne in A.D. 1469 he established a Greek academy in that city, and in it Argyropulus read and expounded the classical Greek writers to the Florentine youth. From Florence he removed to Rome, on account of the plague which had broken out in the former city; the time of his removal is not ascertained, but it was before 1471. At Rome he obtained an ample subsistence by teaching Greek and philosophy, and especially by publicly expounding the works of Aristotle. He died at the age of seventy from an autumnal fever said to have been brought on by eating too freely of melons, but the year of his death is variously stated; all that appears to be certainly known is that he survived Theodore Gaza, who died A.D. 1478. The attainments of Argyropulus were highly estimated in his own and the succeeding age. Thus it is related of Theodore Gaza that, when he found that Argyropulus was engaged in translating some pieces of Aristotle, on

which he had also been occupied, he burnt his own versions, that he might not, by provoking any unfavorable comparison, stand in the way of his friend's rising reputation. The works of Argyropulus are as follows:

Original works —

1. **Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως** *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*; printed with a Latin version in the *Groecia Orthodoxa* of Leo Allatius, 1, 400-418: —
2. *Oratio quarta pro Synodo Florentina*, cited by Nicolaus Comnenus Papadopoli in his *Proenotiones Mystagogice*. We do not know if this has been published, or whether it is in Latin or Greek: —
3. *Commentarii in Ethica Nicomachea* (Florence, 1478). This work comprehends the substance of his expository lectures on the Nicomachian ethics of Aristotle, taken down and published by Donatus Acciajuoli, who is mentioned as a pupil of Argyropulus: —
4. *Commentarii in Aristotelis Metaphysica*, published with Bessarion's version of that work (Paris, 1515, fol.). The other original works of Argyropulus are scattered in MSS. through the libraries of Europe (of which a full list is given by Smith, *ut infra*). He also translated the *Proedicalia*, or *De quinque vocibus* of Porphyry, and the *Homilioe S. Basilii in Hexaemeron*. His version of Porphyry was printed with his translations of Aristotle at Venice in 1496, and that of Basil at Rome in 1515. — See Hody, *De Groecis Illustribus*, p. 187-210; Wharton in Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 2, Appendix, p. 168; Fabricius, *Bibl. Groec.* 3, 496. etc.; 11, 469, etc.; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 587.

John, Abbot Of St. Arnoul Of Metz

is first mentioned in 960, when he succeeded Anstée in that office. He was reputed to be a learned and very liberal man for the times. He granted a charter of freedom to the inhabitants of Maurville formerly serfs of the abbey, and divided the land among them, retaining only for the abbey the right of levying certain taxes. He died about 977. John wrote a Life of St. Glodosinde (Mabillon, *Acta Sanctoe*, vol. 2, col. 1087) and the Life of St. John de Vendière, abbot of Gorze (Bollandii, vol. 3, Feb.). See *Gallia Christ.* vol. 13, col. 900; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 7, 421; Hoefler, *Nouveau Biog. Générale*, 26, 530. (J.N.P.)

John Of Avila

(*Juan de Avila*), the apostle of Andalusia in the 16th century, was born at Almodovar del Campo, a small city of the province of Toledo, about the year 1500. His father intended him for the profession of law, but, after a short stay at the University of Salamanca, he returned home, and spent three years in strict asceticism. Then, after extended studies in philosophy and theology under Domingo de Soto, he commenced preaching with great success. His popularity excited envy, and he was imprisoned for a very short time by the Inquisition. After preaching for nine years in Andalusia, he visited also Cordova, Granada, Baeza, Montilla, etc., where his sermons — chiefly in honor of the Virgin Mary — proved a great success. The highest ecclesiastical offices were now offered him; pope Paul III contemplated even creating him cardinal, but John preferred to continue the work of an itinerant missionary. With a view to the early religious education of the people, and to elevate their moral standing permanently, he established schools at Seville, Ubeda, Baeza, Granada, Cordova, and Montilla. His health failed him, however, and he remained for twenty years sick at the latter place, which accounts for his not accompanying the archbishop of Granada to the Council of Trent. Here he composed his *Epistolario espiritual* (2 vols. 4to), which has been translated into several languages. He died May 10, 1569. His Life has been written by Luis le Granada (see *Obras del V. P. Al. Luis de Granada*, Madrid, 1849; Luis Munnoz, *Vida del Ven. Varon el Maestro Juan de Avila*; Antonio de Capmany, *Teatro historico de la elocuencia Espannola*). See Fr. J. Schirmer, *Werke des Juan de Avila* (*Sermones del santissimo sacramento; de la incarnacion del Hijo de Dios; del Espiritu Santo; las festivitates de la santissima virgen Maria*, etc.), Regensburg, 1856. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 6, 737.

John Baptist,

a French missionary priest in the latter part of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. The son of the emperor of Cochin China, Gya-Long, having come to France with the bishop of Adran in 1787, concluded a treaty with king Louis XVI, by which the latter was to aid him in regaining his throne, which he had lost by a revolution. Events prevented Louis from keeping his promise, but Gya-Long, having regained his kingdom, called to his court the bishop of Adran, who became his prime minister, and John Baptist, who had acted as general vicar to the bishop. He also enacted

several laws favoring Roman Catholicism. The bishop of Adran died in 1817, and Gya-Long himself in 1819. His successor being opposed to Christianity John Baptist left Huë-Foo, the capital of the empire of Annam, where he had resided, travelled through the East, and in 1827 settled in the convent of St. Francis at Macao, where he died July 9, 1847. He is said to have left a collection of interesting documents on China and the other countries he visited. See *Le Constituionnel*, Oct. 17, 1847. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 26:567. (J.N.P.)

John Of Bassora

is the name of a prelate of the Eastern Church who flourished at Bassora, the ancient Bostra, from A.D. 617-650, after whom one of the liturgies of the Oriental Church is named. He was formerly supposed to be the author of it, but Neale thinks it of later date, and supposes it had its origin in the northern parts of Arabia. See Neale, *Hist. of East. Church*, Intro. p. 328 (6).

John Bessarion.

SEE BESSARION.

John Of Beverly.

SEE BEVERLY.

John Borellus.

SEE JOHN OF PARMA.

John Of Bruges.

SEE JORIS, DAVID; SEE ANABAPTISTS.

John Buridanus

a celebrated Nominalist of the 14th century, was born at Bethune, in Artois. He is reputed to have been a pupil of Occam, then to have lectured with great ability and success in Paris, and to have risen to the distinction of rector of the university of that city about 1330, and to have quitted that place only after the Realists had gained the ascendancy, *SEE REALISM* and *SEE NOMINALISM*, and to have assisted in the founding of the university at Vienna. He was looked upon by his contemporaries as one of the most

powerful adversaries of Realism, and distinguished himself also by his rules for finding the middle term in logic, a species of contrivance denominated by some the *Ass's Bridge*, as well as by his inquiries concerning free will, wherein he approached the principles of Determinatism, maintaining that we necessarily prefer the greater of two goods. As for the celebrated illustration which bears his name, of an ass dying for hunger between two bundles of hay, it is not to be found in his writings, which. are, *Quoestiones in X libb. Ethicorum Aristot.* (Paris, 1489, fol.; Oxford, 1637, 4to): — *Quoest. in Polit. Arist.* (Par. 1500, fol.): — *Compendium Logicoe* (Ven. 1499, fol.): — *Summula de Dialecticâ* (Paris, 1487, fol.); etc. Complete editions of his works were published at Paris in 1500, 1516, and 1518. See Bayle, *Histor. Dict.* art. Buridanus; Tennemann, *Gesch. der Phil.* 8, 2, 914 sq.; *Man. of Philos.* (transl. by Morell), p. 246.

John Of Capistran.

SEE CAPISTRAN.

John The Cappadocian,

patriarch of Constantinople (he was the second patriarch of the name of John, Chrysostom being John I) from A.D. 517 or 518, was, before his election to the patriarchate, a presbyter and syncellus of Constantinople. Originally he sided with the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, but he had either too little firmness or too little principle to follow out steadily the inclination of his own mind, for he appears to have been in a great degree the tool of others. On the death of Anastasius, and the accession of the emperor Justin I, the orthodox party among the inhabitants of Constantinople raised a tumult, and compelled John to anathematize Severus of Antioch, and to insert in the diptychs the names of the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, and restore to them those of the patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius. These diptychs were two tables of ecclesiastical dignitaries, one containing those who were living, and the other those who had died in the peace and communion of the Church, so that insertion was a palpable declaration of orthodoxy, and erasure of heresy or schism. These measures, extorted in the first instance by popular violence, were afterwards sanctioned by a synod of forty bishops. In A.D. 519, John, at the expressed desire of Justin, sought a reconciliation with the Western Church, from which, under Anastasius, the Eastern Church had separated, and in this task John displayed considerable cunning. Not only

was he successful in restoring a friendly and union like feeling between the Greek and Roman churches, but Hormisdas even left to him the task of bringing about also the reconciliation of the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria to the orthodox Church. *SEE HORMISDAS*. In this he failed. John died about the beginning or middle of the year 520, as appears by a letter of Hormisdas to his successor Epiphanius. John wrote several letters or other papers, a few of which are still extant. Two short letters (*Ἐπιστολαί*), one to John, patriarch of Jerusalem, and one to Epiphanius, bishop of Tyre, are printed in Greek, with a Latin version, in the *Concilia*, among the documents relating to the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 536 (5, col. 185, ed. Labbe; 8, 1065-67, ed. Mansi). Four relations, or Libelli, are extant only in a Latin version among the Epistolae of pope Hormisdas (in the *Concilia*, 4, 1472, 1486, 1491, 1521, edit. Labbe; 8, 436, 451, 457, 488, edit. Mansi). It is remarkable that in the two short Greek letters addressed to Eastern prelates John takes the title of *οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης*, *oecumenical*, or *universal patriarch*, *SEE PATRIARCH*, and is supposed to be the first that assumed this ambitious designation. It is remarkable, however, that in those pieces of his which were addressed to pope Hormisdas, and which are extant only in the Latin version, the title does not appear; and circumstances are not wanting to lead to the suspicion that its presence in the Greek epistles is owing to the mistake of some transcriber, who has confounded this John the Cappadocian with John the Faster. It is certainly remarkable that the title, if assumed, should have incurred no rebuke from the jealousy of the popes, not to speak of the other patriarchs equal in dignity to John; or that, if once assumed, it should have been dropped again, which it must have been, since the employment of it by John the Faster (q.v.), many years after, was violently opposed by pope Gregory I as an unauthorized assumption. We may conjecture, perhaps, that it was assumed by the patriarchs of Constantinople without opposition from their fellow prelates in the East during the schism of the Eastern and Western churches, and quietly dropped on the termination of the schism, that it might not prevent the reestablishment of friendly relations. See Theophanes, *Chronog.* p. 140-142, ed. Paris (p. 112, 113, ed. Ven.; p. 253-256, ed. Bonn); Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1, 503; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 11, 99; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 592.

John Chrysostom.

SEE CHRYSOSTOM.

John Of Citrus

(now *Kitro* or *Kidros*), in Macedonia, the ancient Pydna, was bishop of that see about A.D. 1200. He is the author of *Αποκρίσεις πρὸς Κωνσταντῖνον Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Δυρῤῥαχίου τὸν Καβάσιλαν* (*Responsa ad Constantinum Cabasilum, Archiepiscopum Dyrrachii*), of which sixteen answers, with the questions prefixed, are given with a Latin version in the *Jus Groeco-Romanorum* of Leunclavius (Frankf. 1596, folio), 5, 323. A larger portion of the Response is given in the *Synopsis Juris Groeci* of Thomas Diplovaticius (Diplovatizio). Several MSS. of the *Responsa* contain twenty-four answers, others thirty-two; and Nicholas Comnenus Papadopoli, citing the work in his *Proenotiones Mystagogicoe*, speaks of a hundred. In one MS. he is mentioned with the surname of *Dalassinus*. Allatius, in his *De Consensu*, and *Contra Hottingerum*, quotes *De Consuetudinibus et Dogmatibus Latinorum* as the production of John of Citrus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Groeca*, 11, 341, 590; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 2. 279; Smith. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, 2, 593.

John Climacus.

SEE JOHN THE SCHOLAR, 2.

John The Constant,

elector of Saxony. SEE REFORMATION (in Germany).

John Of Constantinople.

SEE JOHN THE DEACON; SEE JOHN THE FASTER.

John (I, Patriarch) Of Constantinople.

SEE CHRYSOSTOM.

John (II, Patriarch) Of Constantinople.

SEE JOHN THE CAPPADOCIAN.

John (II, Patriarch) Of Constantinople.

SEE JOHN THE SCHOLAR (1).

John (VI, Patriarch) Of Constantinople

was appointed by the emperor, Philippicus Bardanes, A.D. 712, for his Monothelite opinions and his rejection of the authority of the sixth ecumenical (third Constantinopolitan) council. Cyrus, the predecessor of John, was deposed to make way for him, according to Cave. John was deposed, not long after his elevation, in consequence, apparently, of the deposition of his patron Philippicus, and the elevation of Artemius or Anastasius II. Theophanes does not notice the fate of John, but records the elevation of his successor, Germanus, metropolitan of Cyzicus, to the patriarchate of Constantinople A.D. 715. John wrote *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν ἁγιώτατον πάπαν Ῥώμης ἀπολογετική* (*Epistola ad Constantinum Sanctissimum Papam Romanum Apologetica*), in which he defends certain transactions of the reign of Philippicus. This letter is published in the *Concilia* (6, col. 1407, ed. Labbe; 12, col. 196, ed. Mansi). It had previously been published in the *Auctarium Novum* of Combefis, 2, 211. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 11, 152; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1, 619; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, 2, 593.

John Of Cornwall

was an eminent theologian of the 12th century whom both England and France claim as their own. Little is known of his life. He appears to have studied at Paris under Peter Lombard and Robert of Melun, and to have died towards the close of the 12th century. Great uncertainty also prevails respecting his writings; still he is generally considered as the author of a work entitled *Eulogium* (publ. by Martène, *Anecdota*, 5, col. 1637). It is a special treatise on the human nature of Christ, refuting the subtle distinctions of Gilbert de la Porrée and other scholastic theologians, who maintained that Christ, *quoad hominem*, could not be considered as a mere person, *aliquis*; or, in other words, his humanity was but a contingent or accidental form of his nature. This doctrine had already been condemned by pope Alexander III in the Council of Tours (1163). Casimir Oudin considers him also as the author of *Libellus de Canone mystici libamini*, contained in the works of Hugo of St. Victor, vol. 2, etc. See Cas. Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.*; *Hist. Lit. de la France*, vol. 14. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* 26, 543.

John Of Crema,

a cardinal who flourished in the first half of the 12th century, is celebrated for his exertions in behalf of the cause of pope Calixtus II against his adversary Burdin, and especially for his activity in the English Church, whither he was sent by pope Honorius II, in 1126, to enforce the laws of celibacy on the English clergy. How successful he was in this mission may be best judged from the sudden termination of his stay on the English continent. Not only did the English clergy violently oppose the cardinal's efforts, but he was even entrapped into a snare that must have considerably annoyed the eminent Roman Catholic ecclesiastic. Says Lea (*Hist. Sacerdotal Celib.* p. 293; compare Inett., *Hist. Eng.* Ch. 2, chap. 8), the cardinal, "after fiercely denouncing the concubines of priests, and expatiating on the burning shame that the body of Christ should be made by one who had just left the side of a harlot, he was that very night surprised in the company of a courtesan, though he had on the same day celebrated mass." Although instrumental, after his return to Rome, in the election of pope Innocent II (1130), the latter afterwards forsook him, and John for a time espoused the cause of the rival pope, Anacletus, returning, of course, again to obedience to Innocent II as soon as he had learned that by such an act only he could advance his own interests. The time of his death is not known, to us.

John, The Deacon

and orator (Διάχωνος καὶ Ρήτωρ) of Constantinople, was a deacon of the great church (St. Sophia) in that city about the end of the 9th century. He wrote Λόγος εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ ὑμνογράφου (*Vita S. Josephi Hymnographi*), published in the *Acta Sanctorum* (April 3), vol. 1, a Latin version being given in the body of the work, with a learned *Commentarius Proevius* at p. 266, etc., and the original in the Appendix, p. 34. Allatius (*De Psellis*, c. 30) cites another work of this writer, entitled Τίς ὁ σκοπὸς τῷ θεῷ τῆς πρώτης τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλάσεως. κ. τ. λ. (*Quid est Consilium Dei in prima Hominis formatione, etc.*). The designation JOANNES DIACONUS is common to several medieval writers, as John Galenus or Pediasmus; John Hypatius John, deacon of Rome; and, John Diaconus, a contemporary and correspondent of George of Trebizond. See *Acta Sanctorum*, 1. c.; Fabricius, *Biblica Groeca*, 10, 264, 11, 654; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 2, Dissertatio

1, 11; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Ecclesiasticis*, 2, 335. — Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* 2, 594.

John Of Cressy.

SEE JOHN THE MONK.

John Cyparissiôta

(Κυπαρισσιώτης), surnamed *the Wise*, an ecclesiastical writer, lived in the latter half of the 14th century, not in the middle of the 12th, as erroneously stated by Labbe in his *Chronologia Brevis Ecclesiasticorum Scriptorum*. Cyparissiota was an opponent of Gregory Palamas (q.v.) and his followers (the believers in the light of Mount Tabor), and most of his works (of which some were written after 1359) had reference to that controversy. They compose a series of five treatises, but only the first and fourth books of the first treatise of the series, *Palamiticarum Transgressionum Libri 4*, have been published. They appeared, with a Latin version, in the *Auctarium Nocissimum* of Combefis, 2, 68-105, and the Latin version was given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, 21, 476, etc. (ed. Lyons, 1677). Cyparissiota wrote also Ἐκθεσις στοιχειώδης ῥήσεων θεολογικῶν (*Expositio Materiarum eorum que de Deo a Theologis dicuntur*). The work is divided into one hundred chapters, which are subdivided in ten decades or portions of ten chapters each, from which arrangement the work is sometimes referred to by the simple title of *Decades*. A Latin version of it by Franciscus Turrianus was published at Rome in 1581, 4to, and was reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, 21, 377, etc. — Combefis, *Auctar. Novissim.* 2, 105; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 11, 507; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. 2, Appendix by Gery and Wharton, p. 65; Oudin, *De Scriptor. et Scriptis Ecclesiasticis*, 3, 1062; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 594.

John Of Damacus

(JOHANNES DAMASCUS, Ἰωάννης Δαμασηκνός) (1), one of the early ecclesiastical writers, and the author of the standard textbook of dogmatic theology in the Greek Church, was born at Damascus about the year 676. His oratorical talents caused him to be surnamed *Chrysorrhœas* (golden stream) by his friends (the Arabs called him *Mansur*). Little is known of his life except that he belonged to a high family, was ordained priest, and entered the convent of St. Sabas at Jerusalem, where he passed his life in

the midst of literary labors and theological studies. The other details found concerning him in his biography by John, patriarch of Jerusalem, are considered untrustworthy. According to this writer, John Damascenus's father was a Christian, and governor of the province of Damascus, then in the hands of the Saracens, and John was ably educated by an Italian monk. Under Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Capronymus he zealously defended image worship both by his pen and tongue, and even went to Constantinople on that account. A legendary story relates that Leo, who was then a decided iconoclast, forged a treasonable letter from John to himself, which he contrived to pass into the hands of the caliph, who sentenced John to have his right hand cut off, when the severed hand was restored to the arm by a miracle. About that time, however, John withdrew from the caliph's court to the monastery of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, where he passed the remainder of his life in ascetic practices and study. He died between 754 and 787. In the former year we find his last public act, a protest against the Iconoclastic Synod at Constantinople, and in the latter the (Ecumenical Council of Nice honored his memory with a eulogy. The Greek Church commemorates him on November 29 and December 4, and the Roman Catholic Church on May 6. Church writers agree in considering John Damascenus as superior to all his contemporaries in philosophy and erudition; yet his works, though justifying his reputation, are deficient in criticism.

The most important literary achievement of Damascenus is the [Πηγὴ γνώσεως](#) (Source of Knowledge), comprising the following three works:

1. [Κεφάλαια Φιλοσοφικά](#), or *Dialectics*, which treats almost exclusively of logical and ontological categories, based mainly on Aristotle and Porphyry: —

2. [Περὶ αἰρέσεων ἐνσυντονία](#), *De hoeresibus*, containing in 103 articles a chronological synopsis of the heresies in the Christian Church, with a few articles on the errors of pagans and Jews (the first eighty are really the work of Epiphanius; the remainder partly treat of the heresies from the time of Epiphanius to that of the image controversies, according to Theodoretus, Sophronius, Leontius of Byzantium, etc., and partly of fictitious sects, which merely represent possible, not actual errors of belief): —

3. The third and most important work, to which the former two were really simply the introduction, is entitled [Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς πίστεως](#)

ὀρθοδόξου, *Doctrines of the Orthodox Church*, collected from the writings of the Church fathers, especially Gregory of Nazianzum, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Cyril, Nemesius, and others. The whole work is divided into 100 sections or four books (the latter is probably a later arrangement), and treats of the following subjects:

(a) *God's existence, essence, unity, and the possibility of knowing him.*

Though John teaches that it is neither impossible to know God, nor possible to know him all; that his essence is neither expressible nor entirely inexpressible, he nevertheless inclines to the transcendental character of the idea of God, assigning to human thought incapacity for its conception, and referring man, in the end, as Areopagites does, to the record of divinely revealed truth. It may be considered as a characteristic feature of his theology that it principally dwells on God's metaphysical attributes, hardly touching the ethical question.

(b) *The Trinity*, to which he gives great prominence. He not only repeats the doctrines of the Greek Church, as well as the arguments of the Greek fathers, but resumes a scientific construction of the dogma within the established creed, though admitting that there are certain bounds to the inquiry, which human reason cannot scale (**Ἀδύνατον γὰρ εὐρεθῆναι ἐν τῇ κτίσει εἰκόνα ἀπαραλλάκτως ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος παραδεικνύουσας**). The Trinity, therefore, cannot be adequately conceived nor defined. His real object in the discussion seems to be to found the personality of the **λόγος** and of the **πνεῦμα ἅγιον** upon the unity of the divine essence, and, further, to describe the nature of coexistence, and of personal difference in the Triune, and the reciprocal relations of the three persons — **περιχώρησις**—with all attainable strictness, and he attempts to achieve this result rather by the negative process of excluding fallacies than by positive demonstration. Whenever he ventures upon the latter he fluctuates between Peripateticism, tending to Tritheism and Platonism, leading almost imperceptibly to Sabellianism and Modalism.

(c) *Creation, Angels, and Doemons.* On these he simply collects the doctrines of his predecessors, closing with a somewhat lengthy exposition of his views on heaven, heavenly bodies, light, fire, winds, water, earth, also chiefly based on the authority of the fathers. Some singular opinions of his own he attempts to support by scriptural passages.

(d) *Man, his creation and nature*, are so treated by him that they may aptly be termed a psychology *in nuce*. Here he again depended on Aristotle and other Greek authors, in part directly, and in part through the medium of Nemesius, *περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*. Like a genuine son of the Greek Church, he lays particular stress on the doctrine of free will and its efficacy for good, and treats in connection therewith of the doctrines of providence and predestination, following in the footsteps of Chrysostom and Nemesius.

(e) *Man's fall* is merely adverted to in the vague oratorical manner of Semipelagian writers, without the least regard for the great development which this doctrine had received in the Western Church.

(f) The doctrine of *the person of Christ* is argued with greatest fullness, and he evinces no little ingenuity and dialectic skill in treating of the personal unity in Christ's twofold nature (which he conceived as enhypostasis, not anhypostasis, of the human nature in the Logos), of the *communicatio idiomatum* (which, however, amounts to merely a verbal one), and of volition and the operation of volition in Christ. This exposition of Christology is followed by controversial tracts against the Acephali: *περὶ συνθετου φύσεως*; and against the Monothelites: *περὶ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ δύο θελημάτων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν καὶ λοιπῶν φυσικῶν ἰδιωμάτων*, etc. (comp. Baur, *Gesch. d. Dreieinigkeit*, 2, 176 sq.; *Christologie*, 2, 257).

(g) *Baptism* (which is allegorically represented as sevenfold) he holds to be necessary for the forgiveness of sin and for eternal life. Body and soul, to be purified and saved, need regeneration, which comes from the water and the Spirit.

(h) *Faith* "is the acceptance of the *παράδοσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καθολικῆς*, and of the teachings of Scripture; it is also confidence in the fulfilment of God's promises and in the efficacy of our prayers. The former depends on ourselves, the latter is a gift of the Holy Spirit." On the relation of faith to works, on regeneration and sanctification, he but imperfectly repeats the Semipelagian views of the earlier Greek teachers. His remarks on the cross and on adoration reflect the miraculous spirit of the times.

(i) The *Eucharist* John teaches to be the means by which God completes his communication of himself to man, and thus restores him to immortality. Transubstantiation, in the full acceptance of the term, he does not teach,

though Romanists have tried to interpret his writings in favor of their views. He admits, it is true, that the Eucharist is the actual body of Christ, but he does not consider it *identical* with that which was glorified in heaven, and does not deem the bread and wine mere accidental phenomena.

(j) *On Mary, the Immaculate Conception, Relics, and the Worship of Images*, he expresses himself more explicitly in separate treatises. The authority for adoring the cross, images, etc., he finds, not in Scripture, but in tradition.

(k) In his remarks on *the Scriptures* he alludes simply, and that very briefly, to inspiration, and the value of Holy Writ, repeats the canon of the O.T. according to Epiphanius, and includes in the books of the N.T. the canons of the apostles according to the Trullan canon. Incidentally he also adverts to the four different formulas used in Scripture to designate Christ and the origin of evil, which he holds can neither be assigned to God, nor to an evil principle independent of God. Celibacy John attempts to vindicate by the Scriptures; he alludes to the abrogation of circumcision, to anti-Christ, resurrection, and the last judgment. These are the principal contents of John's main work. He has by no means done equal justice to all its parts; the important questions of atonement, sin, grace, and the means of salvation, receive only a cursory notice. The style of his discourse, owing to the diversity of his sources, is not uniform; while, for the most part, it has strength and fluency, it sometimes lapses into rhetorical prolixity and affectation. John was particularly inclined to the philosophy of Aristotle, and wrote various popular tracts, in which he collected and illustrated that philosopher's principles. He wrote also letters and treatises against heretics, especially against the Manichaeans and Nestorians. His works have been collected by Le Quien under the title *Opera omnia Damasceni Joh. quoa extant*, etc., Gr. and Lat. (Venet. 1748, 2 vols. 8vo). This edition contains Κεφάλαια φιλοσοφικά; Περὶ αἱρέσεων; Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως; Πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὰς ἀγίας εἰκόνας; Λίβελλος περὶ ὀρθοῦ προνοήματος; Τόμος; Κατὰ Μανιχαίων Διάλογος; Διάλογος Σαρακηνοῦ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ; Περὶ δρακόντων; Περὶ ἀγίας Τριάδος; Περὶ τοῦ τρισαγίου ὕμνου; Περὶ τῶν ἀγίων νηστειῶν; Περὶ τῶν ὀκτῶ τῆς πονηρίας πνευμάτων; Εἰσαγωγή δογμάτων στοιχειώδης; Περὶ συνθέτου φύσεως; Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ δύο θελημάτων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν καὶ λοιπῶν φυσικῶν ἰδιωμάτων; Ἔπος ἀκριβέστατον κατὰ θεοστυγοῦς αἱρέσεως τῶν Νεστοριανῶν; Πασχάλιον; Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς

περὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκόνων; Περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων; Ἱερὰ παράλληλα, etc.

John of Damascus is now generally regarded as one of the ablest men of the Greek Church in the 8th century; but he by no means, on that account, deserves to be honored with the title of “philosopher.” He was not an independent inquirer, but simply “an acute and diligent compiler and expounder of what others had thought, and the Church received.” “He was,” as an American ecclesiastic has well put it, “in design, method, and spirit, the precursor of the scholastic theologians. They, indeed, lived in another quarter of the globe from Syria, spoke a different language, and drew their materials from a different source. With them Augustine was the chief authority, whereas Damascenus followed Gregory of Nazianzum and other Greek fathers as his principal guides. The spirit of the age no doubt acted in a similar way upon both. It was considered unsafe, both in a religious and in a civil point of view, to think differently from the Church and its reverend teachers. In the West, as well as in the East, Aristotle had come to be regarded as an oracle. These circumstances may account, in part, for the similarity which we perceive both in the Greek theologian and in Peter of Lombardy, the first great scholastic theologian of the Latin Church. But no one who has compared the orthodox faith of the one with the sentences of the other can well doubt that some of the early translations of the former were employed in the composition of the latter. It cannot, probably, be far from the truth to say that, while Augustine is the father of the scholastic theology as to the matter of it, the learned Greek of Damascus was the father of it as to its form.”

John of Damascus is generally considered as the restorer of the practice of chanting in the Greek Church, and he is also named as the author of a number of hymns yet in use in that Church. It is by no means proved, however, that he was the inventor of musical notation, as some have affirmed. Copies of a MS. treatise on Church music, of which he is considered the author, are to be found in several European (public) libraries: it was published by abbé Gerbert in the 2d vol. of his treatise *De Cantu et Musica Sacra*. It was translated into French by Villoteau in his memoir *Sur l'État actuel de l'Art musical en Egypte* (in *Description de l'Egypte*, 14, 380 sq.). See Jean de Jerusalem, *Vie de St. Jean de Damas* (in Surius, *Vitoe Sanctorum*, May 6); Lenström, *De fidei orthod. auctore J. Damasceno* (Upsal. 1839); Fabricius, *Bibl. Groeca*, 9, 682-744; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1, 482 (Lond. ed. 1688); Ceillier, *Histoire gén. des auteurs*

sacrés, 18, 110 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 20, 420; *Christian Rev.* 7, 594 sq.; Hagenbach, *Doctrines* (see Index); Fétis, *Biog. des Musiciens*.

John Of Damascus (2).

SEE JOHN OF JERUSALEM (3).

John, Jacobite Bishop Of Dara

(a city in Mesopotamia, near Nisibis) in the first half of the 9th century (not in the 6th or 7th, as says Cave in his *Hist. Litt.* 2, 131, nor in the 4th, as is maintained by Abraham Ecchelensis, nor in the 8th, as it is said by Assemani in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 2, 118; see also 2, 219 and 347). He was a contemporary of Dionys. of Telmahar, who dedicated his chronicle to him (see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 2, 247). A manuscript of the Vatican, used by Abraham Ecchelensis, contains three works in Syriac by John:

1. *De resurrectione coporum*, in four books: —
2. *De hierarchia celesti et ecclesiastica*, two books, ascribed to the pseudo-Dionysius on account of the similarity of names: —
3. *De sacerdotio*, four books (Assemani, 2, 118 sq.). He is also considered as the author of the book *De Anima* (Assemani, 2, 219), which he probably composed after the work of Gregory of Nyssa, whose writings he also used otherwise (Assemani, 3, 22); and also an Anaphora (according to the *Catalogus liturgiarum.* by Schulting, pt. 3, p. 106, No. 29). — Herzog. *Real-Encyk* 6, 746. (J.N.P.)

John De Dieu

(JOHANNES A DEO), saint, founder of the order of charity, was born at Monte-Mor-el-Novo, Portugal, March 8, 1495. An unknown priest stole him from his father, a poor man called Andrea Ciudad, and afterwards abandoned him at Oropesa, in Castile. After roving about many years, he was led to dedicate himself to a religious life by the preaching of John of Avila, whom he heard at Grenada. So excited became he, that, according to Richard and Glraud, he went through the town flogging himself, and never stopped till he went, half dead, to the hospital. He resolved to devote himself to the care of the sick, and changed his family name for *de Dieu* (a Deo), by permission of the bishop of Tui. In 1540 he opened the first house

of his order at Seville, and died March 8, 1550, without leaving any set rules for his disciples. In 1572 pope Pius V subjected them to the rule of St. Augustine, adding a vow to devote themselves to the care of the sick, and sundry other regulations. *SEE CHARITY, BROTHERS OF*. John de Dieu was canonized by pope Alexander VIII, October 16, 1690. He is commemorated on the 8th of March. See Castro et Girard de Ville-Thierry, *Vies de St. Jean de Dieu*; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, March 8; Heliot, *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, vol. 4, ch. 18; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 26, 442 sq.

John Of Drandorf,

a Saxon Hussite, renowned as one of the ablest of the German reformers before the Reformation, was born of noble parentage at Slieben, or Schlieben, in the diocese of Meissen, about the beginning of the 15th century. He studied at Dresden under the celebrated Peter Dresdensis, then went to Prague, and further imbibed reformatory opinions, and finally completed his studies at the newly-founded University of Leipzig. Unable to obtain ordination on account of his heretical proclivities, he travelled through Germany and Bohemia, preaching against all unfaithful shepherds of the Roman Church, and finally succeeded in gathering a congregation, first at Weinsberg, then at Heilbronn. The civil authorities, however, interfered, and he was imprisoned and transported to Heidelberg, there to be judged by the faculty of the university, which took so active a part in the trial and condemnation of Huss and Jerome at the Council of Constance. The faculty met February 13, 1425, and, after a few days' hearing, John of Drandorf was condemned as a heretic, and was burned at Worms in great haste, lest the laymen, as these doctors have it, should partake of his heretical spirit. See Krummel, in *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1869, 1, 130 sq. (J.H.W.)

John Duns Scotus.

SEE DUNS SCOTUS.

John Of Egypt

(JOANNES ÆGYPTIUS), a Christian martyr who suffered in Palestine in the Diocletian persecution, is spoken of by Eusebius, who knew him personally, as the most illustrious of the sufferers in Palestine, and especially worthy of admiration for his philosophic (i.e. ascetic) life and

conversation, and for the wonderful strength of his memory. After the loss of his eyesight he acted as anagnostes, or reader in the church, supplying the want of sight by his extraordinary power of memory. He could recite correctly whole books of Scripture, whether from the Prophets, the Gospels, or the apostolic Epistles. In the seventh year of the persecution, A.D. 310, he was treated with great cruelty; one foot was burned off, and fire was applied to his sightless eyeballs for the mere purpose of torture. As he was unable to undergo the toil of the mines or the public works, he and several others (among whom was Silvanus of Gaza), whom age or infirmity had disabled from labor, were confined in a place by themselves. In the eighth year of the persecution, A.D. 311, the whole party, thirty-nine in number, were decapitated in one day by order of Maximin Daza, who then governed the eastern provinces. See Eusebius, *De Miartyrib. Paloestinoe*, sometimes subjoined to the eighth book of his *Hist. Eccles.* c. 13; Smith. *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* 2, 585.

John Eleemosynarius.

SEE JOHN THE ALMSGIVER.

John (Surnamed Lackland) King Of England,

and youngest son of Henry II, was born at Oxford Dec. 24, 1166. After the conquest of Ireland, his father, in accordance with a bull from the pope authorizing Henry II to invest any one of his sons with the lordship of Ireland, appointed him to the government of that country in 1178, and he removed thither in 1185; but he failed so utterly in the task that he was recalled in a few months. He had always been the favorite of his father, and is said to have caused his death by joining his elder brothers in rebellion against Henry (of course, the controversy with Thomas a Becket, and his remorse after the archbishop's death, contributed no little to the sudden death of Henry II). Upon his brother Richard's succession he obtained a very favorable position in the English realm; indeed, so many earldoms were conferred on him that he was virtually sovereign of nearly one third of the kingdom. But this by no means satisfied John, by nature base, cowardly, and covetous. During the absence of his brother on a crusade, he sought even to obtain for himself the crown, but failed signally, earning only a very unenviable reputation for himself, while greatly increasing the affection of the English people for Richard. Upon the death of the latter, John, by express wish of Richard on his death bed, ascended the long-

coveted throne (May 26, 1199). The accusation that John avoided the claims of Arthur, the son of his elder brother Geoffrey, by imprisoning him and then privately putting him out of the way, are questions which belong to secular historians. It remains for us to state here only that king Philip Augustus of France, who had espoused John's cause in opposition to Richard, now espoused the cause of Arthur, and involved John in a war in which the latter was severely the loser, France regaining by 1204 the provinces that had been wrested from her. Far more serious were the results of another contest into which he was drawn, in 1205, by the death of the archbishop of Canterbury, and which forms a most important chapter in the history of investiture. Insisting upon the royal right of investiture, John first waged war against his own clergy, until finally Innocent III also took up the gauntlet, and thus drew upon himself not only the formidable hostility of the whole body of the national clergy, but also of one of the ablest and most imperious pontiffs of Rome, *SEE INNOCENT III*. The question at issue was, of course, the election of a successor to the lately vacated archbishopric. It had hitherto been the custom of the clergy to defer the election to any vacancies in their ranks until the king had favored them with a *conge d'elire*. In this instance some of the juniors of the monks or canons of Christ Church, Canterbury, who possessed the right of voting in the choice of their archbishop, had proceeded to the election without such a grant from the royal chair, and chosen Reginald, their subprior, as successor, and installed him in the archiepiscopal throne before daylight.. Having enjoined upon him the strictest secrecy, they sent him immediately to Rome to secure the pontiff's confirmation of their act. The foolish Reginald, however, disclosed the secret, and it came to the ears of the king and the suffragan bishops of Canterbury. He at once caused the canons of Christ Church to proceed to a new election, and suggested John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, for the honorable position, who was accordingly installed, likewise against the wish of the suffragan bishops. These appealed to Rome, and John and the canons of Canterbury were forced to do likewise. This afforded Innocent III, ever on the alert to make his imperial power felt, a valuable opportunity to place forever at his own disposal one of the most important dignities in the Christian Church. Acceding to the doctrine of the invalidity of Reginald's election, he maintained that the new vacancy could only have been declared such by the sovereign pontiff, and that therefore the choice of the bishop of Norwich also was illegal, and put forth as the candidate for the primacy cardinal Langton, an Englishman by birth, but a devoted follower of the papal

prince. Of course the monks, however reluctantly, acted on the suggestion of the supreme head of the Church; but John by no means gave his adhesion to an act the important results of which he could well foresee. He at once initiated violent measures against the native clergy, determined to retain for the crown the rights of investiture (q.v.). Innocent III, however, finding that he could not conquer the stubborn John by kind measures, at first mildly hinted the interdict, and in 1208 actually subjected the whole kingdom to this ecclesiastical chastisement, and the year following added to it the excommunication of John himself, absolving his subjects from their allegiance to him, and permitting them even to depose him from the throne. But John paid little heed to this display of "ecclesiastical thunder," and in the midst of it even ventured to engage in war with Scotland, and with an energy quite uncommon to him suppressed all rebellious outbursts in his own domains. Innocent, finding his "ecclesiastical artillery" to be inefficient against England's king, entered into league with Philip Augustus, and caused the latter to prepare for an invasion of England. This undertaking soon brought John to terms, and in 1213 (May 13) he at last consented to submit to all the demands of the Holy See, of which the admission of the pope's nominee, Stephen de Langton, to the archbishopric of Canterbury, was the first. Nay, he even yielded much more than could have consistently been asked of him by the Roman see, and perpetrated an act of disgraceful cowardice, which has heaped everlasting infamy on his memory. Two days after, he made over to the pope the kingdoms of England and Ireland, to be held by him and by the Roman Church in fee, and took to his holiness the ordinary oath taken by vassals to their lords (see Reichel, *The Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 251 sq.). It is not to be wondered at that the Roman see now readily conceded to the demand of John that hereafter there should be an oblivion of the past on both sides, and that the bull of excommunication should be revoked by the pope, while, in return, John was obliged to pledge that of his disaffected English subjects those who were in confinement should be liberated, and those who had fled or been banished beyond seas should be permitted to return home. Philip, whose ambition was not a little mortified by this sudden agreement of pope and king, persisted in his invasion scheme, though no longer approved by Rome; but the French fleet was totally defeated in the harbor of Damme, 300 of their vessels were captured and above 100 destroyed. Subsequent events, however, proved more favorable to France, and aggravated the discontent at home against John. At length the English barons, tired of their tyrannical ruler, after vainly petitioning for more liberal concessions,

assembled at Stamford to wage war themselves against him, and marched directly on London, where they were hailed with great joy by the citizens. The king; fearing for his throne, now gladly consented to a conference. They met the king at Runnymede, and, as a result of this meeting, they obtained, on June 15th, 1215, the Great Charter (Magna Charta), the basis of the English Constitution. The pope, who had constantly opposed the English in their revolutionary movements, soon after annulled the charter, and the war broke out again. The barons now called over the dauphin of France to be their leader, and Louis landed at Sandwich on May 30th, 1216. In attempting to cross the Wash, John lost his regalia and treasures, was taken ill, and died at Newark Castle on Oct. 19th, 1216 in the 49th year of his age. "All English historians paint the character of John in the darkest colors: and the history of his reign seems to prove that to his full share of the ferocity of his line he conjoined an unsteadiness and volatility, a susceptibility of being suddenly depressed by evil fortune, and elated beyond the bounds of moderation and prudence by its opposite, which gave a littleness to his character not belonging to that of any of his royal ancestors. He is charged, in addition, with a savage cruelty of disposition, and with the most unbounded licentiousness, while, on the other hand, so many vices are not allowed to have been relieved by a single good quality" (*Engl. Cyclopedia*, s.v.). Of course this may all be due to the fact that John has had no historian, that his cause expired with himself, and that every writer of his story has told it in the spirit of the opposite and victorious party; and, further, that the intense disgust always felt by every class of his countrymen at his base surrender of his kingdom in vassalage to the pope may have led them to regard with less distrust all adverse reports respecting his general character. See Milman, *Lat. Christ.* 5, ch. 5; Hallar, *Middle Ages*; Lingard, *Hist. of England*, 2, ch. 2; Hume, *Hist. of Engl.* 1, ch. 11; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 3, § 54; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 7, 235 sq.; Inett, *Hist. Enql. Ch.* 2, ch. 19 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, 2, 212 sq. (J.H.W.)

John, Monophysite (Missionary) Bishop Of Ephesus,

generally called *Episcopus Asioe*, as Ephesus is the most important see of Asia Minor (see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* t. 2, *Diss. de Monophysit.* § 9, s.v. Asia), was a native of Amid (?), Syria, and lived in the 6th century (about 591). He resided chiefly in Constantinople, and was highly esteemed at court, especially during the reign of Justinian. The latter appointed him to inquire into the state of the heathen, of whom there was yet a large number in the empire, even in Constantinople and to secure their conversion. Quite

successful in his efforts at home, the emperor authorized John to take a missionary tour through the whole empire, and we are told that this time he converted 70,000 people, and founded 96 churches (comp. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 43). He seems not to have had any direct spiritual jurisdiction over the metropolis of Asia Minor, but to have been honored with the title simply on account of his great success as a missionary, and we are inclined to believe that in reality he was simply a “missionary bishop,” for he is often styled “he who is sat over the heathen” (Syr. [apnj l xd](#)), and also “the destroyer of idols” (Syr. [arktp rbj m](#)). How long John remained a favorite with Justinian we do not know, but have reason to suppose that his fate depended upon the success of his Monophysite brethren. In the reign of Justin II he shared largely in the sufferings which befell the Monophysites at the instigation of John of Sirimis. The period, circumstances, and place of his death are uncertain. He is probably *the John Rhetor* mentioned by Evagrius and Theodorus Lector, and whom the former calls (lib. 5, c. 24) his compatriot and his relative. Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* 2, 84) opposes this identity, but without good reasons. John wrote a historical work, in three parts, in Syriac, which is of great importance for the Church history of the East. The first part appears to be totally lost, and of the second only a few fragments, quoted by Assemani, are preserved to us. It is indeed the third part alone that has come down to us, and that only in a somewhat mutilated form. Dionysius of Telmahar, in his chronicle (from Theodosius the younger to Justin II), used this part freely; and Assemani obtained his passages (*Biblioth. Orient.* 1, 359-363, 409, 411-414; 2, 48 sq., 51, 52, 87-90, 312, 328, 329) from this source and from Bar-Hebraeus (*Chron. Syr.* ed. Bruns and Kirsch, p. 2, 83, 84). These were the only sources through which the work of John was known to us until the third part of it (somewhat incomplete) was discovered by William Cureton among the Syrian MSS. brought to England from the Syrian monasteries of Egypt by Dr. Tattam and A. Pacho, in 1843, 1847, and 1850. This third part was published under the title *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John, Bishop of Ephesus. Now first edited by William Cureton* (Oxf. 1855, 4to, pp. 420). The first two parts, forming twelve books, contained, as the author himself says (p. 2), the history of the Church from the beginning of the Roman Empire to the sixth year of the reign of Justinus II, nephew of Justinian, and consequently to the year 571. The third part forms six chapters, of which we have only the second and fifth in full; the others are all more or less incomplete (see Bernstein, *Zeitsch. der D. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, 8, 397). It continues the

history to the third year after the death of Justinus II (581) (see bk. 6, ch. 25, p. 402), and mentions even later dates down to 583. We find in it accounts of many facts of ecclesiastical history not to be discovered in other sources. It is the more important from the fact that the author, although a partisan of the Monophysite doctrine, and occasionally somewhat over credulous, was a contemporary, and often an eyewitness of the facts he relates. Cureton promised an English translation of the work, but to our knowledge it has not yet appeared. The German scholar Schonfelder (*Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt. Mit einer Abhandlung u. d. Treiheiten* [Munch. 1862, 8vo]) has, however, furnished a German translation, of which those who do not read the Oriental languages can avail themselves in their studies of the Eastern Church. In 1856 a young Dutch scholar, Dr. Land, published a treatise on *John, Bishop of Ephesus, the first Syriac Church historian* (for the full title, see below), in which he discussed the general relations of Syriac literature, and the productions of the Syriac Church historians in particular, the person and history of bishop John, his style and treatment of Church history, and the contents of his work. Since then, Dr. Land has continued his studies of the Syriac writers, and in vol. 2 of his *Anecdota Syriaca* (also under the special title *Joannis, Episcopi Monophysitoe Scripta Historica* [Leyd. 1868, 8vo]), has published all the inedited works of John of Ephesus. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 747; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 16, 207 sq. (J.H.W.)

John Of Euchaita

(*Euchaitoe* or *Euchania*) (a city afterwards called *Theodoropolis*) was archbishop of Euchaita (**Μητροπολίτης Ε χαΐτων**), and lived in the time of the emperor Constantine and Monomachus (A.D. 1042-1054), but nothing further is known of him. He was surnamed *Mauropus* (**Μαυρόπους**), i.e. "Blackfoot." He wrote a number of iambic poems, sermons, and letters. A volume of his poems was published by Matthew Bust (Eton, 1610, 4to). They were probably written on occasion of the Church festivals, as they are commemorative of the incidents of the life of Christ or of the saints. An *Officium*, or ritual service, composed by him, and containing three canones or hymns, is given by Nicolaus Rayaeus in his dissertation *De Acolouthia Officii Canonici*, prefixed to the *Acta Sanctorum*, Junii, vol. 2. John wrote, also, *Vita S. Dorothei Junioris*, given in the *Aeta Sanctorum*, Junii, 1, 605, etc. Various sermons for the Church festivals, and other works of his, are extant in MS. See Fabricius, *Biblioth.*

Orient. 8, 309, 627, etc.; 10, 221, 226; 11, 79; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* 2, 139; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles.* 2, 606; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* 2, 595.

John Of Falkenberg,

surnamed *Jacobita de Saxonia*, or *Doctor de Pratensis*, a German Dominican, is celebrated for the zeal with which he defended pope Gregory XII in the Council of Constance. He also endeavored to defend the regicidal opinions of John Petit, but he failed in both instances. He next at the request of the Knights of the Cross, wrote a libel against Wladislas Jagellon, king of Poland, for which he was declared a heretic, and condemned to imprisonment for life at Rome. Pope Martin V, however, liberated him a few years after, and John, encouraged, now demanded of Paul of Russdorf, grand master of the Knights of the Cross, the price of the libel he had written. The latter offering him but a small amount, John of Falkenberg insulted him, whereupon he was again imprisoned, and condemned to be drowned. He escaped, however, retired to the convent of Kampen, and wrote against the order. He was present at the Council of Basle, in 1431, and died shortly after. See Echard, *Script. Ord. Froed.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 26, 563.

John The Faster

(JOHANNES JEJUNATOR OR NESTEUTES), of humble extraction, became patriarch of Constantinople in 582. He was distinguished for his piety, benevolence, strong asceticism, and fasting. He was the first who assumed the title of "ecumenical patriarch," and thereby involved himself in difficulties with the bishops of Rome, Pelagius II and, Gregory I, the opening of a struggle which resulted finally, in the 11th century (1054), in a complete rupture of the churches of Rome and Constantinople. (See the article GREGORY I, and Ffoulkes, *Christendoms's Divisions*, vol. 1, § 17.) John died Sept. 2, 595. The Greek Church counts him among its saints. He is reputed the author of Ἀκολουθία καὶ τάξις τῶν ἐξομολογουμένων; Λόγος πρὸς τὸν μέλλοντα ἐξαγορεύσαι τὸν αὐτοῦ πνευματικὸν υἱόν, which belongs to the earliest penitential works of the Greek Church (pub. by Morinus, *Comm. hist. de administratione sacramenti poenitentiae*, Paris, 1651, Ven. 1792, etc.). See Oudin, *De Scr. Eccles.* 1, 1473 sq.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, 10, 164 sq.; Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.*

1, 216 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 17, 56 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 748; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 556.

John (Called Also Jeannelin), Abbot Of Fecamp,

France, was born in the neighborhood of Ravenna. His family name Labbe supposes to have been *Dalye*, or *D'Alye*. He came to France with William, abbot of St. Benigne of Dijon, and studied under that learned man. He practiced medicine with success; but William going to Fecamp to reform the abbey, and install there a colony of Benedictines, John accompanied him, was made prior, and finally succeeded William as abbot. He reformed several convents, and by his firm adherence to discipline embroiled himself with many prelates, sustained, however, in every instance by the pope. In 1054 he visited England, where he was welcomed by king Edward, but, having subsequently undertaken a journey to the Holy Land, he was made prisoner by the Mohammedans, and is said to have only returned to France in 1076. He died Feb. 2, 1079. He wrote a book of prayers, the preface of which is to be found in Mabillon, *Analecta*, 1, 133, and three chapters in the *Meditationes S. Augustini*. He is also considered as the author of a treatise, *De Divina Contemplatione*, publ. in 1539, under the title of *Confessio Theologica*, and attributed to John Cassien, etc. See *Gallia Christ.* 11, col. 206; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 8, 48; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, 26, 531.

John Frederick,

elector of Saxony. *SEE REFORMATION*; *SEE SAXONY*.

John Gallensis.

SEE CANON LAW, vol. 2, p. 88 (2).

John Of Gischala,

son of Levi, named after his native place, *SEE GISCHALA*, was one of the most celebrated leaders of the unfortunate Jews of Galilee in their final struggle with the Romans, A.D. 66-67. Of his personal history we know scarcely anything. The only writer to whom we can go for information – Josephus — is prejudiced, because John of Gischala proved the most formidable rival of the renowned Jewish historian, and he is on that account depicted by Josephus in a very disparaging manner. His deeds, however, indicate to every fair-minded person that he belonged to that class of men

who, for the defense of their country, readily ignore all other duties. We are furthermore encouraged to give credence to the noble picture which Grätz (*Gesch. der Juden*, 3, 396) has drawn of John, when we remember that the virtuous and learned Simon ben-Gamaliel was a devoted and life-long friend of our hero. (By this it must, however, by no means be inferred that we are ready to accept Grätz's views on the character of Josephus, for which we refer our readers to the art. JOSEPHUS.) Though by nature Josephus' superior, more particularly in the art of warfare, he readily submitted himself to the commands of the man whom the Sanhedrim had seen fit to invest with superior authority. Not so patriotic was the conduct of Josephus, who, in his jealousy, hesitated not to put every obstacle in the way of John, so as to prevent the success of his noble and patriotic efforts. This impolitic conduct of Josephus towards all who seemed to present any likelihood of becoming rivals in office continued until the people's attention was directed to it, and their anger against him was so great that his very life was in danger. Instead, however, of profiting by this sad experience, Josephus, in his vanity and blindness, continued, so soon as he felt that the danger had passed, his animosity towards his collaborators, especially towards John of Gischala, whom he hesitated not to accuse even of having headed the attacks upon his life (Josephus, *Life*, 18, 19), a reproach which was not in the least deserved by John, who, however great his disappointment in Josephus, never sought relief by violent measures. It is true that, when he found the people's confidence in Josephus restored, he sent messengers to Simon ben-Gamaliel and to the Sanhedrim to remove the man in whom public confidence was so misplaced. Ordered to the defense of his native place, John did everything in his power to strengthen the fortification of Gischala, and when, after a long siege from the experienced troops of Titus, he found it impossible to hold the city with his handful of countrymen, more accustomed to the ploughshare than to the sword, he made his escape by a game of strategy which his enemy could never forgive him. Having obtained an armistice from the Romans on pretense that the day was their Sabbath, he improved the opportunity to make his escape with his forces to Jerusalem. The sacred city was at this time unfortunately divided of itself, anarchy reigned within the walls, and it was with great difficulty that John succeeded in rallying the people to their defense against a common enemy. He actually aroused them to sally forth against the Roman invaders, and succeeded in destroying the first works erected by them to besiege the city. Not so happy were they in their future undertakings. Defeat after defeat finally obliged John to seek refuge in the

tower of Antonia. Soon after followed the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), and John now sought refuge in a neighboring cave, determined not to fall into the hands of Titus. But hunger soon proved even a more formidable foe than the Romans, and John gladly went forth from his hiding place to surrender himself to them, who, in their pride and the savage state of that age, hesitated not to increase the mental agonies of the poor Jew by marching him, with 700 other fellow countrymen, at the head of the victorious legions to the Eternal City, to enhance the magnificence of his public triumph. The grand spectacle over, John was imprisoned at Rome, and died in a dungeon of broken heart. Not so lucky, even, was his brother in arms, Simon bar-Giora (q.v.), who was dragged through the streets of Rome by a rope; and finally executed, in accordance with Roman custom which demanded a human sacrifice in honor of a victory gained over their enemies. See Josephus, *War*, 4, 2 sq.; Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, vol. 3, ch. 14 and 15; Raphall, *Post Bibl. Hist. of the Jews*, 2, 416 sq. (J.H.W.)

John Goch.

SEE GOCH.

John Of Gorz,

a French monk of some note who flourished in the 10th century, was born at Vendiere, near Pont-a-Mousson, and studied theology under Berner, deacon of Toul. After joining various convents — among the last that of the Recluses — and not finding that earnest piety and strict ascetic life which he sought to impose upon himself, he finally gathered a few true friends of like mind in the convent of Gorz, presented to them by bishop Adalbert, of Mayence. In the latter part of his life, Otho the Great sent him as ambassador to Abderrahman II, in Cordova. His biography was written by a friend and contemporary, St. Arnulph (died 984), and is given by Pertz, *Monum.* 4, 335.

John The Grammarian.

SEE JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

John Hyrcanus.

SEE HYRCANUS.

John The Italian

(*Johannes Italus*) (1). a monk of the 10th century. He was at first canon at Rome, but his acquaintance with Odon, abbot of Clugny, led him to France, and he entered a convent there. Some say that he afterwards returned to Italy, and became prior of a Roman convent, while others say that he became abbot of some French Cistercian convent, and that he died in France after 945. Our information regarding his personal history is derived only from his biography in the Life of St. Odon (in Mabillon, *Acta Sanct.* 7, 152). He published extracts of St. Gregory's *Moralia*. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 6, 265; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacres*, 12, 825.

John The Italian

(*Italus*, Ἰταλός) (2), a Greek philosopher and heretic who flourished in the time of Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118), escaped to Italy after the revolt of Maniaces against Constantine, and there prosecuted his preparatory studies. He finally returned again to Constantinople, and became a disciple of Michael Psellus the younger. His learning and ability attracted general attention, and the emperor Michael Ducas (1071-1078), finding himself in need of a man acquainted with the Italian provinces to influence them to a return to the Byzantine empire, selected John Italus for this purpose, and dispatched him to Dyrrachium. He, however, proved unfaithful to the trust, and, his intrigues having become public, was obliged to flee to Rome to avoid persecution. He was subsequently allowed to return to Constantinople, and there entered the monastery of Pega. When Psellus was banished in 1077, John was made first professor of philosophy (ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων), and filled this place with great success. Yet he was better acquainted with logic and Aristotle's philosophy than with the other branches of science, and was but little versed in grammar and rhetoric. He was very passionate and hasty in argument, and sometimes even resorted to bodily violence, but he was, fortunately, prompt in acknowledging his errors. He expounded to his pupils Proclus, Plato, Jamblichus, Porphyrius, and Aristotle, but often in a manner quite inconsistent with the position of Christian orthodoxy. Alexius, soon after ascending the throne, caused Italus's doctrines to be examined, and summoned him before an ecclesiastical court. Notwithstanding the protection of the patriarch Eustratius, John Italus was obliged publicly to recant and anathematize eleven heretical opinions advanced in his lectures. Among other things, he was accused of "ridiculing image-worship."

Continuing, however, to teach the same doctrines, he was anathematized by the Church, and, fearing persecution, he forsook the rostrum. It is said that in his later years he publicly renounced his errors. His principal works (all in MSS.) are, "Ἐκδοσις εἰς διάφορα ζητήματα; Ἐκδοσις εἰς τὰ τοπικά; Περὶ διαλεκτικῆς; Μέθοδος ῥητορικῆς ἐκδοθεῖσα κατὰ σύνοψιν; some discourses, etc. See Anna Comnenus, *Alexius*, 5, 8, 9; Fabricius, *Bibl. Groeca*, 3, 213-217; 6, 131; 11, 646-652; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 2, 154; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles.* 2, col. 760; Lambece, *Commentar. de Biblioth. Coesar.* 3, col. 411, edit. Kollar; Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, 81, 49; Hase, *Notices d. Manuscripts*, vol. 9. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 26, 557.

John Jejunator.

SEE JOHN THE FASTER.

John Of Jerusalem (1),

originally a monk, was bishop of Jerusalem (A.D. 386) when not much more than thirty years of age (Jerome, *Epist.* 82, 8). Some speak of him as patriarch, but Jerusalem was not elevated to the dignity of a patriarchate until the following century. John was a man of insignificant personal appearance (Jerome, *Lib. contra Joan.* c. 10), but he was generally celebrated for eloquence, talent, and learning.. He was acquainted, at least in some degree, with the Hebrew and Syriac languages, but it is doubtful if he was acquainted with Latin. He is said to have been at one period an Arian, or to have sided with the Arians when they were in the ascendant under the emperor Valens (Jerome, *Lib. contra Joan.* c. 4, 8). For eight years after his appointment to the bishopric he was on friendly terms with St. Jerome, who was then living a monastic life in Bethlehem or its neighborhood; but towards the close of that period strife was stirred up by Epiphanius of Constantia (or Salamis), in Cyprus, who came to Palestine to ascertain the truth of a report which had reached him, that the obnoxious sentiments of Origen were gaining ground under the patronage of John. Epiphanius' violence against all that had even the appearance of Origenism led him into a controversy with John also. SEE EPIPHANIUS . Whether John really cherished opinions at variance with the orthodoxy of that time, or only exercised towards those who held them a forbearance which was looked upon with suspicion, we do not know; but he became again involved in squabbles with the supporters of orthodox views. He was

charged by them with favoring Pelagins, who was then in Palestine, and who was accused of heresy in the councils of Jerusalem and Diospolis (A.D. 415), but was in the latter council acquitted of the charge, and restored to the communion of the Church. *SEE PELAGIUS*. In the controversies waged against Chrysostom, John of Jerusalem always sided decidedly with Chrysostom. *SEE CHRYSOSTOM*. John wrote, according to Gennadius (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 30), *Adversus Obtretractores sui Studii Liber*, in which he showed that he rather admired the ability than followed the opinions of Origen. Fabricius and Ceillier think, and with apparent reason, that this work, which is lost, was the apologetic letter addressed by John to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, which resulted in a reconciliation between John and Jerome. No other work of John is noticed by the ancients; but in the 17th century two huge volumes appeared, entitled *Joannis Nepotis Sylvani, Hierosolym. Episcopi 44, Opera omnia quoe hactenus incognita, reperiri potuerunt: in unum collecta, suoque Auctori et Auctoritati tribus Vindiciarum libris asserta per A.R.P. Petrum Wastelium* (Brussels, 1643, fol.). The *Vindiciae* occupied the second volume. The works profess to be translated from the Greek, and are as follows:

(1) *Liber de Institutione primorum Monachorum, in Lege Veteri exortorum et in Nova perseverantium, ad Capirasium Monachum. Interprete Aymerico Patriarcha Antiocheno*. This work is mentioned by Trithemius (apud Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 10, 526) as “*Volumen insigne de principio et profectu ordinis Carmelitici*,” and is ascribed by him to a later John, patriarch of Jerusalem (in the 8th century). It is contained in several editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, in which work, indeed, it seems to have been first published (vol. 9, Par. 1589, fol.), and in the works of Thomas a Jesu, the Carmelite (1, 416, etc., Cologne, 1684, folio). It is generally admitted to be the production of a Latin writer, and of much later date than our John: —

(2) *in stratagemata Beati Jobi Libri 3*, a commentary on the first three chapters of the book of Job, often printed in Latin among the works of Origen, but supposed to belong neither to him nor to John: —

(3) *In S. Matthoeum*, an imperfect commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, usually printed, under the title of *Opus imperfectum in Matthoeum*, among the works of Chrysostom, in the Latin or Graeco-Latin editions of that

father, but supposed to be the work of some Arian or Anomoean about the end of the 6th or some part of the 7th century: —

- (4) *Fragmenta ex Commentario ad prima Capita xi S. Marci*, cited by Thomas Aquinas (*Catena Aurea ad Evang.*) as a work of Chrysostom: —
- (5) *Fragmenta ex Commentario in Lucam*, extant under the name of Chrysostom, partly in editions of his works, partly in the Latin version of a Greek *Catena in Lucam* published by Corderius (Antw. 1628, folio), and partly in the *Catena Aurea* of Thomas Aquinas: —
- (6) *Homilioe* 58, almost all of them among those published in the works of Chrysostom. There is no good reason for ascribing any of these works to John; nor are they, in fact, ascribed to him except by the Carmelites. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 9, 299; 10, 525, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1, 281, etc.; Dupin, *Nouv. Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, 3, 87, ed. Par. 1690; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, 2, 596.

John Of Jerusalem (2).

A synodical letter of John, who was a patriarch of Jerusalem early in the 6th century, and his suffragan bishops assembled in a council at Jerusalem A.D. 517 or 518, to John of Constantinople [John of Cappadocia], is given in the *Concilia* (vol. 5, col. 187, etc., ed. Labbe; 8, 1067, ed. Mansi).

John Of Jerusalem (3)

[or OF DAMASCUS, 2]. Three extant pieces relating to the Iconoclastic controversy bear the name of John of Jerusalem, but it is doubtful how far they may be ascribed to the same author, hence we add them herein simply under a separate heading. They are,

1. Ἰωάννου εὐλαβεστάτου τοῦ Ἱεροσολυμίτου μοναχοῦ Διήγησις, or *Joannis Hierosolymitani reverendissimi Monachi Narratio*, a very brief account of the origin of the Iconoclastic movement, published by Combefis among the *Scriptores post Theophanem* (Par. 1685, fol.), and reprinted at Venice, A.D. 1729, as part of the series of Byzantine historians; it is also included in the Bonn edition of that series. It is also printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Gallandius, 13, 270: —

2. Διάλογος στηλιτευτικὸς γενόμενος παρὰ πιστῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων καὶ πόθον καὶ ζῆλον ἔχόντων πρὸς ἕλεγχον τῶν ἐναντίων τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀγίων καὶ ὀρθοδόξων ἡμῶν

πατέρων or *Disceptatio invectiva quoe habita est a fidelibus et orthodoxis, studiumque ac zelum habentibus ad confutandos adversarios fidei atque doctrinae sanctorum orthodoxorumque patrum nostrorum*, first published by Combefis in the *Scriptores post Theophanen* as the work of an anonymous writer, and contained in the Venetian, but not in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine writers. It is also reprinted by Gallandius (*ut supra*), p. 352, and ascribed to John of Damascus or John of Jerusalem, some MSS. giving one name, and others giving the other. Gallandius considers that he is called Damascus from his birthplace. The author of this invective is to be distinguished from the greatly celebrated John of Damascus (q.v.), his contemporary, to whom, perhaps, the transcribers of the manuscripts, in prefixing the name Damascus, intended to ascribe the work: —

3. Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς περὶ τῶν ἀγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκόνων, πρὸς πάντας Χριστιανοὺς καὶ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν Καβαλῖνον καὶ πρὸς πάντας αἰρετικούς, or *Joannis Damasceni Monachi ac Presbyteri Oratio demonstrativa de sacris ac venerandis imaginibus, ad Christianos omnes, adversusque Imperatorem Constantinum Cabalinum*. The title is given in other MSS., **Ἐπιστολὴ Ἰωάννου Ἱεροσολύμων ἀρχιεπισκόπου, κ. τ. λ.** — *Epistola Joannis, or Hierosolysmitani Archiepiscopi*, etc. The work was first printed in the *Auctarium Novum* of Combefis (Paris, 1648, folio), vol. 2, and was reprinted by Gallandius (*ut supra*), p. 358, etc. Fabricius is disposed to identify the authors of Nos. 1 and 3, and treats No. 2 as the work of another and unknown writer; but Gallandius, from internal evidence, endeavors to show that Nos. 2 and 3 are written by one person, but that No. 1 is by a different writer, and this seems to be the preferable opinion. He thinks there is also internal evidence that No. 3 was written in the year 770, and was subsequent to No. 2. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 7, 682; Gallandius, *Bibl. Patrum*, 13, Prolegomena, ch. 10, p. 15; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 596.

John Of Jerusalem (4),

patriarch of Jerusalem, who flourished probably in the latter half of the 10th century, was the author of a life of Joannes Damascenus, **Βίος τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ συγγραφεὶς παρὰ Ἰωάννου πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων** (*Vita sancti Patris nostri Joannis Damasceni a Joanne Patriarcha Hierosolymitano conscripta*). The work is

a translation from the Arabic, or at least founded upon an Arabic biography, and was written a considerable time after the death of John of Damascus (A.D. 756), and after the cessation of *the Iconoclastic contest*, which may be regarded as having terminated on the death of the emperor Theophilus (A.D. 842). But we have no data for determining how long after these events the author lived. Le Quien identifies him with a John, patriarch of Jerusalem, who was burnt alive by the Saracens in the latter part of the reign (A.D. 963-9) of Nicephorus Phocas, upon suspicion that he had excited that emperor to attack them (Cedrenus, *Compend.* p. 661, edit. Paris 2, 374, ed. Bonn). This life of John of Damascus was first published at Rome with the orations of Damascenus (*De Sacris Imaginibus* [1553, 8vo]); it was reprinted at Basel with all the works of John of Damascus A.D. 1575; in the *Acta Sanctorum* (May 6), vol. 2 (the Latin version in the body of the work [p. 111, etc.], and the original in the Appendix [p. 723, etc.]); and in the edition of the *Works of Damascenus* by Le Quien, vol. 1 (Paris, 1712, folio). The Latin version is given (s.d. 6 Maii) in the *Vitoe Sanctorum* of Lippomani, and the *De Probatiss Sanctorum Vitis* of Surius. See Le Quien, *Joannis Damasceni Opera*, note at the beginning of the *Vita S. J. Damasc.*; and *Oriens Christianus*, 3, 466. — Fabricius, *Bibl. Groeca.* 9, 686, 689; 10, 261; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 2, 29; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 598.

John The Laborious

(JOHANNES PHILOPONUS, also surnamed ALEXANDRINUS and GRAMMATICUS), an Eastern scholar of great renown, was born at Alexandria towards the close of the 6th century or the beginning of the 7th. Of his personal history but very little seems to be definitely known. He is said to have been present at the capture of that city by the Mohammedans (A.D. 639), and to have temporarily embraced their creed to prevent the burning of the Alexandrian library; but the truth of this story is rather doubtful (comp. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall Rom. Emp.* ch. 51). The great renown of John Philoponus is due mainly, perhaps, to his speculations on Christian doctrine, more especially his theories on the Trinity, cosmogony, and immortality. He was a passionate admirer of Plato and Aristotle, and hence his persistency in amending Christian dogma by philosophy, and hence much ambiguity in his position on Christian doctrines, and hence also the reason why he has so frequently been the subject of attack as a heretic. It is especially his theory on the Trinity that has classed him among the Tritheists, of which he has even often, though inaccurately, been pointed

out as the founder, while in truth he was only a forerunner of them. See, however, TRITHEISM. His principal work on dogmatics, *Διαιτητής ἢ περὶ ἐνώσεως*, is lost, yet, from extracts of it still extant, the following has been determined to be his position on the doctrine of the Trinity. Nature and hypostasis he regards as identical; a double nature in Christ is incompatible with one hypostasis; and to the objection that in the Trinity there are confessedly three hypostases and but one nature, he argues that in the Trinity three particular and individual existences or hypostases are comprised under the idea of unity. This unity, however, is merely the generic term, which comprehends the several particulars, the *Κοινὸς τοῦ εἶναι λόγος*. If this be called nature, it is done in an abstract sense, and is inductively derived from particulars; but if *φύσις* is to convey the sense of independent existence, it must join the particular, individual being, and, therefore, the hypostasis. Applying this argument to Christ, he concludes that to the unity of his hypostasis belongs also the unity of nature. (Comp. again TRITHEISM, and Dorner, *Doct. Person of Christ*, diss. 2, vol. 1, p. 148, 414.) His works extant are:

- (1) *De oeternitate mundi*, or *ἀιδιότητος κόσμος* (Ven. 1535, fol.), in which he attempts to establish the Christian dogma of creation by reason alone, without reference to Biblical authority. The ideas are eternal only when they are regarded as creative thoughts of God; as such they are inherent in Providence, and their realization adds nothing to divine perfection. God, by his *ἔξις*, was eternally Creator, and his essence required no new characteristics by the *ἐνέργεια*. The world itself cannot be eternal, for the effect cannot be equal to the cause: —
- (2) In his *Commentaria in Mosaicam mundi creationem*, or *Περὶ κοσμοποιίας* (edited by Corder, Vienna, 1630), he attempts to reconcile the Mosaic account of creation with the facts derived from our own experience: —
- (3) In his *Περὶ ἀναστάσεως* (known to us only from Photius [Cod. 21-23], Nicephorus [*H.E.* 18, 47], and Timotheus [*De receptu hoeret. in Cotil. Mon.* 3, 414 sq.]) he separates the sensual from the spiritual creation, a concession to philosophy made at the expense of Christianity. “The rational soul,” he argues, “is not only an , but an imperishable substance, entirely distinct from all irrational existence, in which matter is always associated with form. In consequence of this inseparable connection of matter and

form, the natural body is destroyed and annihilated by death. The resurrection of the body is the new creation of the body:" —

(4) *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀστρολάβου χρήσεως* (published by Hase, Bonn, 1839): —

(5) *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* against Jamblichus): —

(6) *Commentaries on Aristotle* (Venice, 1509, 1534, 1535, etc.): —

(7) *Grammatical Essays* (in Labbe, *Glossaria*, London, 1816), etc. See J. G. Scharfenberg, *De J. Ph.* (Leipzig, 1768); Fabricius, *Biblioth. Groeca*, 10, 639 sq.; Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philos.* 6, 500 sq., *Stud. u. Ku.rit.* 1835, p. 95 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 760; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, 3, 321.

John A Lasco.

SEE LASCO.

John Of Leitomyśl.

SEE LEITOMYSL.

John Of Leyden.

SEE BOCCOLD.

John The Little,

or JOHANNES PARVUS (*Jean Petit*), a French theologian, was born in Normandy in the latter half of the 14th century. He was at one time professor of theology in the University of Paris, but was deposed for having, on the 8th of March, 1408, pronounced a discourse in justification of the murder of the duke of Orleans, brother of the king of France, who was assassinated by the duke of Burgundy. He died at Hesdin, France, in 1411. — Pierer, *Unit. Lex.*

John Maro.

SEE MARONITES.

John Of Matha, St.,

founder of the *Order of the Holy Trinity* (also called *Fathers of Mercy* in Spain, and *Mathurins* in Paris), was born at Faucon, in Provence, in 1154, of noble parents. He studied at Paris University, and then entered the Church. "At his first celebration of divine service," the legend goes, "he beheld a vision of an angel clothed in white, having a cross of red and blue on his breast, with his hands, crossed over each other, resting on the heads of two slaves, who knelt on each side of him; and believing that in this vision of the mind God spoke to him, and called him to the deliverance of prisoners and captives, he immediately sold all his goods, and forsook the world, to prepare himself for his mission." In conjunction with Felix of Valois he arranged the constitutions of the new order, and together they went to Rome to obtain the approval of pope Innocent III; Felix having had, the legend continues, a similar dream, the pope gladly complied with their request, and the order was approved Feb. 2, 1199. Gaucher III, of Chatillon, having given them the estate of Cerfroi, they there established their first convent. They also obtained several other convents and hospitals in France and Spain, and a convent and church at Rome. Having collected large sums of money, John dispatched two of his brotherhood to the coast of Africa, whence they returned with 186 Christians redeemed from the Mussulman's bonds. The year following John himself went to Tunis, preaching on his way all through Spain, and creating many friends for his noble undertaking: he returned with 110 captives. From another voyage he returned with 120 Christians. Hereafter he devoted himself to preaching at Rome. He died there Dec. 21, 1213, and was canonized by Innocent XI, July 30, 1679. He is commemorated on February 8. The dress of the order consists in a flowing white gown, with a red and blue cross on the breast. See P. Ignace Dillaud, *Vie de St. Jean de Matha* (1695); Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Feb. 8; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gen.* 26, 441; Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of Monastic Orders*, p. 217 sq.

John Of Meda, St.,

founder, or rather reformer of the order of the *Humiliati*, was born at Meda, near Como, towards the close of the 11th century. He was a member of the Oldrati family of Milan. After ordination he withdrew to the solitude of Rondenario, near Como, which he subsequently left to join the *Humiliati*, then a lay congregation. Chosen their superior, he subjected them to the rule of St. Benedict, only changing the appellations of *brethren*

and *monks* into *canons*. He obliged them also to say the Virgin's mass every day, and composed a special breviary for their use, which was called *canons' office*. The Humiliati (q.v.) thus became a regular order, with clerical and lay members. John of Meda gained a large number of proselytes by his preaching, and was reputed very charitable. He died Sept. 26, 1159, and was canonized a few days after his death by pope Alexander III. See St. Antonin, *Hist.* part 2, § 15, ch. 23; Sylvestre Maurolyc, *Mare Ocean di tutti li Relig.*; Moreri, *Grand Dict. historique*; Richard et Giraud, *Biblioth. Sac.* — Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, 26, 441.

John The Monk

(*Johannes Monachus*), or JOHN OF CRESSY, a French canonist, was born at Cressy, Ponthieu, in the 13th century. He was a Cistercian monk and was created cardinal. He died in 1313. He wrote commentaries on the decretals of Boniface VIII and Benedict IX, and was the first who wrote on the whole *Sextus* of Boniface VIII. The same work was afterwards done by Guido de Baisio, and still better by Johannes Andreae. The glossaries of Johannes Monachus were annotated and published by Phil. Probus, doctor of the school of Bourges. His MSS., under the title *Glossoe in sextum decretalium*, are preserved in the public library of Chartres. He is also considered by some as the author of the *Defensorium Juris*, but this is not proved. See Savigny, *Catalogue de la Bibl. de Chartres*, 4, 274. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 26, 559. (J.N.P.)

John Of Monte Corvino,

a celebrated early Roman missionary among the Mongols, belonged to the Franciscan order, and flourished towards the close of the 13th century. He was born in Monte Corvino, a small city in Apulia, and had, previous to his appointment as Eastern missionary, distinguished himself (in 1272) as ambassador of the emperor Michael Palaeologus to pope Gregory X in behalf of a contemplated union of the Eastern and Western churches. He had travelled in the East, and, aware of the opening for Christianity among the Mongols, had urged the Roman see to dispatch missionaries to them; but their efforts proved unsuccessful, and in 1289 he finally, at the instance of pope Nicholas IV, set out for that distant field himself. Of an energetic character, discouraged by no reverses however great, or trials however severe, he finally succeeded in building up a Christian Church. As an instance of his undaunted courage may be cited the fact that he had to buy

the children of natives in order to educate them in Christian doctrines, and through them to influence maturer minds. About 1305 he had some six thousand converts, and the prospect of still greater additions. In 1307 other laborers were sent into the field, and John de Monte Corvino was appointed archbishop (his see was named Cambalu), and the Christian interests were advanced among the Mongols even after John's death (1328), until the downfall of the Mongol dynasty. *SEE MONGOLS.* (J.H.W.)

John Of Nepomuk

(more properly POMUK), a very popular Bohemian saint of the Roman Catholic Church, and honored by them as a martyr of the inviolability of the seal of confession. He was born at Pomuk, a village in the district of Klatau, about the middle of the 14th century. After taking orders, he rose rapidly to distinction. He was created a canon of the Cathedral of Prague, and eventually vicar general of the diocese. The queen, Sophia, the second wife of Wenzel or Wenceslaus IV, having selected him for her confessor, Wenceslaus, himself a man of most dissolute life, conceiving suspicions of her virtue, required of John to reveal to him what he knew of her life from the confessions which she had made to him. John steadfastly refused, and the king resolved to be revenged for the refusal. An opportunity occurred soon afterwards, when the monks of the Benedictine abbey of Kladran elected an abbot in opposition to the design of the king, who wished to bestow it upon one of his own dissolute favorites, and obtained from John, as vicar general, at once a confirmation of their choice. Wenceslaus, having first put him to the torture, at which he himself personally presided, had him tied hand and foot, and flung, already half dead from the rack, into the Moldau (March 1393). These historical facts have been considerably enlarged, and embellished with legendary additions, in his biography by Bohuslav Balbinus. According to these, his birth was signalled by miraculous signs, and after his martyrdom his body was discovered by a miraculous light which issued from it, was taken up, and buried with the greatest honor. Several able Romanist writers have frequently attempted to reconcile the points of conflict between the legend and the historical account. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 749 sq.; Pelzel, *Kaiser Wenceslaus*, 1, 262 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 725 sq. Dr. Otto Abel (*Die Sage v. heil. Johan. v. Nep.*) supposes the legend to be a Jesuitical invention, and to date from the restoration of popery in Bohemia, to serve as a popular counterpart to the martyrdom of Huss and Ziska. His

memory is cherished with peculiar affection in his native country. He was canonized as a saint of the Roman Catholic Church by Benedict XIII in 1729, his feast being fixed for the 20th of March. By some historians, two distinct personages of the same name are enumerated — one the martyr of the confessional seal, the other of the resistance to the simoniacal tyranny of Wenceslaus; but the identity of the two is well sustained by Palacky, *Gesch. von Bohmen*, 3, 62. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 556 sq.

John Niciota

(from *Nicius*, probably the city of that name in the Thebais), also surnamed *the Recluse*, patriarch of the Jacobite Alexandrian Church, flourished in the early part of the 6th century, and was in the patriarchal chair from 507 to 517. He is noted for his violent opposition to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and is said to have refused communication with any that did not expressly anathematize them, and to have promised the emperor Anastasius two hundred pounds of gold if he would procure their final and decisive abrogation (see Neale, *Hist. East. Ch.* [Alexandria] 2, 26, 27; Theophanes, s.a. A.D. 512). Among the Jacobites, who in his day enjoyed especial favors at the imperial court (a period on which, says Neale, “the Jacobite writers dwell with peculiar complacency,” and in which “their heresy had gained a footing which it never before or since possessed”), John Niciota, better known as patriarch *John II of Alexandria*, is reckoned among the saints. He is believed to be the author of a learned work against the Pelagians, addressed to pope Gelasius. Some think it was written by John I of Alexandria, but it is in all probability the production of John Niciota, and was written before his accession to the patriarchal chair. (J.H.W.)

John Of Nicklaushausen,

a German religious fanatic, flourished, in the second half of the 15th century, at Nicklaushausen, in the diocese of Wurzburg. He was earning his livelihood as a swineherd when it suddenly occurred to him that an attack upon the clergy, and a summons to them to reform their profligate ways, might meet with applause from the people, to whom at this time “the clergy, as a body, had become a stench in their nostrils.” He was not slow openly and loudly to proclaim his mission (in 1476), to which he claimed he had been inspired by the Virgin Mary, and soon immense flocks gathered about him, who came from the Rhine lands to Misnia, and from Saxony to

Bavaria, so that at times he preached to a congregation of 20,000 or 30,000 men. "His doctrines," says Lea (*Hist. Celibacy*, p. 397), "were revolutionary, for he denounced oppression both secular and clerical; but he was particularly severe upon the vices of the ecclesiastical body. A special revelation of the Virgin had informed him that God could no longer endure them, and that the world could not, without a speedy reformation, be saved from the divine wrath consequent upon them" (comp. Trithemius, *Chronicles Hirsang*. ann. 1476). The unfortunate man, who was a fit precursor of Müncer and John of Leyden, was seized by the bishop of Wurzburg, the fanatical zeal of his unarmed followers easily subdued, and he himself suffered, for his rashness, death at the stake a few days after his trial. (J.H.W.)

John Of Nicomedia,

a presbyter of the Church of Nicomedia, in Bithynia, in the time of Constantine the Great, is noted as the author of **Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλέως ἐπισκόπου Ἀμασειᾶς**, *Acta martyrii S. Basilei episcopi Amasioe*, which is given in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists (Aprilis, vol. 3); the Latin version in the body of the work (p. 417), with a preliminary notice by Henschen, and the Greek original in the Appendix (p. 50). An extract from the Latin version, containing the history of the female saint Glaphyra, had previously been given in the same work (January 1, 771). The Latin version of the *Acta Martyrii S. Basilei* had already been published by Aloysius Lippomani (*Vitoe Sanctor. Patrum*, vol. 7) and by Surius (*Deprobatis Sanctorum Vitis*, s.d. 26 Aprilis). Basilens was put to death about the close of the reign of Licinius, A.D. 322 or 323, and John, who was then at Nicomedia, professes to have conversed with him in prison. Cave thinks that the *Acta* have been interpolated, apparently by Metaphrastes. See *Acta Sanctorum*, ll. cc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1, 185. — Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 601.

John Of Oxford,

an English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 12th century, and took an active and important part in the controversy between king Henry II of England and his archbishop Thomas a Becket in behalf of his royal master, whose favor and unlimited confidence he enjoyed. He had attended the Diet at Würzburg in 1165, held to cement a union between Henry and the emperor of Germany, and had there taken the oath of fidelity to the

rival pope of Alexander, Paschal III, whom the emperor supported. For his success in this mission, John, on his return, was rewarded by king Henry II with the appointment of dean of Salisbury. Of course the archbishop, at this time himself claiming the right to fill these positions, disapproved of the appointment, and even suspended and cited before him for trial the bishop of the diocese of Salisbury, who had approved the royal action. (See Inett, *History of the English Church*, vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 337, note; Robertson, *Life of Becket*, p. 186; note d; compare art. JOCELINE OF SALISBURY and CLARENDON CONSTITUTIONS.) John, disregarding the archbishop's censures, was finally punished by excommunication (in 1166). The king at once dispatched a special embassy to pope Alexander, John of Oxford being one of the number, and, notwithstanding the archbishop's serious actions against John of Oxford, the pope, anxious to continue friendly relations with the English court, favorably received John, and the latter even measurably succeeded in the object of their mission [see art. BECKET], securing also the pope's confirmation of his appointment as dean of Salisbury. After the close of the controversy and the return of Becket, John of Oxford was appointed by the king to meet and reinstate the archbishop, a not very moderate reproof to the haughty prelate; and upon the death of the latter John further received evidence of the grateful remembrance of his royal master by the appointment to the bishopric of Norwich (1175), and as such attended the Lateran Council in 1179. The exact time of his decease is not known to us, neither are we aware that he performed any literary work of value; in all probability, his active part in the king's controversy absorbed all his interests. See Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 4, 364 sq., 408. (J.H.W.)

John Of Paris,

a celebrated French Dominican of the 13th century, was professor of theology at the University of Paris. He owes his renown to the part he took in the controversy then waging between his king, Philip the Fair, and pope Boniface VIII. The latter, fearing his deposition on the plea that the resignation of his predecessor Celestine was illegal, took every means to advance the doctrine of papal absolutism. Not only in matters spiritual, but also in matters temporal, the pope was to be regarded supreme; in short, to save his office; he carried his schemes, for the enlargement of the papal power to the verge of frenzy. Unluckily for Boniface, however, he found his equal in Philip the Fair, who not only denied the temporal power of the pope, but finally even scorned the foolish conduct of Boniface in seeking to

frighten him by issuing bulls against him and his kingdom. The University of Paris sided with the king, and among his most outspoken friends were John of Paris and Accidius of Rome. The former even published a work against the papal assumptions, entitled *De regia potestate papali* (in the collection of Goldast, vol. 2), in which he dared to assert that “the priest, in spiritual things, was greater than the prince, but in temporal things the prince was greater than the priest; though, absolutely considered, the priest was the greater of the two.” He also maintained that the pope had no power over the property either of the Church or her subjects. As the kingdom of Christ is a spiritual one, having its foundation in the hearts of men, not in their possessions, so the power conferred on the pope relates simply to the wants or to the advantage of the universal Church. He also stood up in defense of the independent power of the bishops and priests, and denied that this is derived from God through the mediation of the pope alone, maintaining that it springs directly from God, through the choice or concurrence of the communities. “For it was not Peter, whose successor is the pope, that sent forth the other apostles, whose successors are the bishops; or who sent forth the seventy disciples, whose successors are the parish priests; but Christ himself did this directly. It was not Peter who detained the apostles in order to impart to them the Holy Ghost; it was not he who gave them power to forgive sins, but Christ. Nor did Paul say that he received from Peter his apostolical office, but he said that it came to him directly from Christ or from God; that three years had elapsed after he received his commission to preach the Gospel before he had an interview with Peter.” But more than this he argued. The pope himself was even amenable to a worldly power for his conduct in the papal chair. As such he regarded not simply the Ecumenical Council, but to the secular princes also he believed this right belonged, subject, however, to a demand on the part of the clergy for aid. Neander says (*Ch. Hist.* 5, 18), “If the pope gave scandal to the Church, and showed himself incorrigible, it was in the power of secular rulers to bring about his abdication or his deposition by means of their influence on him or on his cardinals.” If the pope would not yield, they might so manage as to compel him to yield. They might command the people, under severe penalties, to refuse obedience to him as pope. John of Paris finally enters into a particular investigation of the question whether the pope can be deposed or can abdicate, a query that had been raised by the family of the Colonnas, whom the pope had estranged, and who were anxious to make null and void the resignation of pope Celestine, and to reassert the latter’s claim to the papacy. What conclusions he must have

arrived at on this point may be gathered from the preceding remarks. He distinctly affirmed that, as the papacy existed only for the benefit of the Church, the pope ought to lay down his office whenever it obstructed this end, the highest end of Christian love. Though he measurably served Boniface VIII by his last conclusions, he had yet sufficiently aroused the hatred of the Roman see to fear for his position in the Church; and no sooner did an opportunity present itself to Boniface than John was made to feel the strong arm of his opponent. Having advocated in the pulpit, contrary to the Roman Catholic dogma, of the real presence, a so-called *impanation*, viz. “that, in virtue of a union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine, like the union of the two natures in Christ, the predicates of the one might be transferred over to the other,” he was prohibited from preaching by the bishop of Paris. An appeal to the pope, of course, proved futile, and his troubles ended only with his life, in 1304. He embodied his views of the sacrament in his work *Determinatio de modo existendi corporis Christi in Sacramento altaris* (London, 1686, 8vo): — *Correctorium doctrinæ sancti Thomæ*. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 340; 5, sect. 1; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. 3, cent. 13, pt. 2, ch. 3, § 14. **SEE BONIFACE; SEE PAPACY; SEE LORDS SUPPER.**

John Of Parma,

also called JOANNES BORELLUS or BURALLUS, a learned monk of the 13th century, was born at Parma about 1209. He became a Franciscan, taught theology with great success at the universities of Naples, Bologna, and Paris, and in 1247 was made general of his order by the chapter assembled at Avignon. He showed great zeal for the reformation of convents, and strictly enforced the discipline. In 1249 he was sent to Greece by Innocent IV, with a view to the reconciliation of the Eastern Church, but failed in that undertaking, and returned to Italy in 1251. A chapter held at Rome in 1256 accused him of favoring the heresies of Joachim, abbot of Floris, whose work, *The Everlasting Gospel*, he edited, and accompanied with a preface of his own (see Farrar, *Crit. Hist. Free Thought*, p. 86), and he was obliged to resign the generalship of the order. His successor, Bonaventura Fidanza, even caused him to be condemned to imprisonment, but the protection of cardinal Ottoboni, afterwards Adrian V, prevented the execution of the sentence. He was nevertheless obliged to hide himself in the convent of Grecchia, near Rieti. He subsequently set out to return to Greece, but died at Camerino in 1289. He was canonized in the 18th century by the Congregation of Rites. None of his writings were published.

See *Hist. Litteraire de la France*, 20, 23; Wadding, *Script. Ord. Minor.*; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*; Ireneo Affo, *Memorie degli Scrittori et Letterati Parmigiani*; Sbaraglia, *Supplem. et castig. ad Script. Ord. S. Francisc.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 26, 550; Moasheim, *Ch. Hist. cent.* 13, pt. 2, ch. 2, § 33, note. (J.N.P.)

John Parvus.

SEE JOHN THE LITTLE.

John Philoponus.

SEE JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

John Phocas

(Φοκάς), a Cretan monk and priest, son of Matthaëus, who became a monk in Patmos, had served in the army of the emperor Manuel Comnenus (who reigned A.D. 1143-80) in Asia Minor, and afterwards visited (A.D. 1185) Syria and Palestine, is noted for a short geographical account which he wrote of those countries, entitled Ἔκφρασις ἐν συνόψει τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας μέχρις Ἱεροσολύμων κάστρων καὶ χωρῶν Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης καὶ τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστινήν ἀγίωντορων, *Compemidiaria Descriptio Castrorum et Urbium* (sic in Allat. vers.) ab *Urbe Antiochia usque Hierosolymam, necnon Syrioe Phenicioe, et in Paloestina Sacrorum Locorum*, which was transcribed by his son (for he was married before he became a priest), and finally published by Allatius, with a Latin version, in his Σύμμικτα, 1, 1-46. The Latin version is also given in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, Maii 2, ad init. See Allatius, Σύμμικτα, *Proefatiuncula*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 4, 662; 8, 99. — Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 601.

John Phurnes

(Φουρνῆς), a monk of the monastery of Mount Ganus, who flourished in the reign of the emperor Alexis Comnenus (11th century), was an opponent of the Latin Church, and is noted as the author of Ἀπολογία, *Defensio, or Διάλεξις, Disceptatio*, a discussion which was carried on with Peter, archbishop of Milan, in the presence of the emperor. If this is the work which John Veccus cites and replies to in his *De Unione Ecclsiarum Oratio* (apud Allatium, *Groecia Orthodoxa*, 1, 179, etc.), it appears that the form of a dialogue was assumed for convenience' sake, and that it was not the

dialogue of a real conference. According to Fabricius, Allatius also published in his work *De Consensu* (sc. *De Ecclesioe Occidentalis et Orientalis perpetua Consensione*), p. 1153, a work of John which is described as *Epistola de Ritibus immutatis in Sacra Communione*. Other works of John are extant in MS. See Allatius, *Groec. Orthodox.* 50, 100; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 11, 648, 650. — Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 601.

John The Presbyter,

a supposed disciple of Jesus, and instructor of Papias of Hierapolis, is said to have been a contemporary of the apostle John (with whom it is thought he has been confounded by early Church historians), and to have resided at Ephesus. For the assertion that there existed such a person, the testimony advanced is

(1) that of Papias (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 39), who, in speaking of the personal efforts he put forth to establish himself in the Christian faith, says: “Whenever any one arrived who had had intercourse with the elders (τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις), I made inquiry concerning the declarations of these; what Andrew, what Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord. said, *as also what Aristion and John the Presbyter, disciples of the Lord, say.* For I believed that I should not derive so much advantage from books as from living and abiding discourse.” Eusebius in reporting this, takes special pains to report that Papias purposely adduces the name John twice, first in connection with Peter; James, and Matthew, where only the apostle can be intended, *and again along with Aristion, where he distinguishes him by the title of “the Presbyter.”* Eusebius further states that this confirms the report of those who relate that there were two men in Asia Minor who bore that name, and had been closely connected with Christ, and then continues by showing *that two tombs had been found in Ephesus being the name of John.* Further proof is found in another part of his history (7, 25), where he cites Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, about the middle of the 3d century, as uttering the same tradition concerning the finding of the two tombs at Ephesus inscribed with the name of John, and as ascribing to John the Presbyter the authorship of the Apocalypse, which Eusebius himself was inclined to do. The existence of a presbyter John is

(2) declared in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (7, 36), where it is said that the second John was bishop of Ephesus after John the Apostle, and that it was by the latter that he was instituted into office. Further testimony is obtained from Jerome (*De Vir. Ill. c. 9*), who reports the opinion of some that the second and third epistles of John are the production of John the Presbyter, “cujus et hodie alterum sepulcrum apud Ephesum ostenditur, etsi nonnulli putant duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelistae esse.” In defense of the existence of such a person as John the Presbyter appear prominently among modern critics Grotius, Beck, Fritzsche, Bretschneider, Credner, Ebrard, and Steitz (*Jahrb. deutscher Theol.* 1869, 1, 138 sq.), all of whom ascribe to him the authorship of the last two epistles of John, generally believed to be the productions of John the Apostle; also Liicke, Bleek, De Wette, and Neander, who consider John the Presbyter the author of the Apocalypse. The simple question whether another John existed in Asia Minor contemporary with John the Apostle would, of course, be of little import, but the fact that the apostolical authorship of some of the epistles and of the Apocalypse is doubted has called to critical inquiry most of the leading theological minds of our day. The result is that, while some have conceded the existence of another John, clothed even with episcopal dignity (Dollinger, *First Age of the Church*, p. 113), others have denied altogether the probability of the existence of such a person contemporary with the apostle John (see Schaff, *Church History*, Apostolic Age, p. 421, note). Dr. W.L. Alexander, in reviewing the proofs of those who assert the existence of John and his authorship of some of the Johannean writings, thinks that in the way of this assumption stands the following: 1. “The negative evidence arising from the silence of all other ancient authorities, especially the silence of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who, in a list of eminent teachers and bishops in Asia Minor, preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* v, 24), makes no mention of John the Presbyter; and, 2. The positive evidence afforded by the statement of Ireneus, who not only omits all mention of the Presbyter, but says that Papias was a hearer of John the Apostle along with Polycarp (*adv. Hoeres.* 5, 33). [Not so thinks Donaldson in his *Hist. Christ. Lit. and Doctr.* 1, 312 sq.] This counter evidence has appeared to some so strong that they have thought it sufficient to set aside that of Papias, who, they remind us, is described by Eusebius as a man of a very small intellect (σφόδρα μικρὸς τὸν νοῦν *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 39). [See Schaff; below.] But this seems going too far. Papias describes himself as a hearer of the presbyter John (Euseb. 5, 24), and in this he could hardly be mistaken, whatever was his deficiency in

intellectual power [this view is advocated by Zahn (in his *Hermas*) and Riggenbach (*Jahrb. deutscher Theol.* 13, 319); against it, see Steitz (in *Jahrb.* 14, 145 sq.)]; whereas it is very possible that Irenaeus may have confounded the presbyter with the apostle, the latter of whom would be to his mind much more familiar than the former. The silence of Polycrates may be held proof sufficient that no John the Presbyter was bishop of Ephesus, or famed as a teacher of Christianity in Asia Minor; but, as Papias does not attest this, his testimony remains unaffected by this conclusion. On the whole, the existence of a John the Presbyter seems to be proved by the testimony of Papias; but beyond this, and the fact that he was a disciple of the Lord, nothing is certainly known of him. Credner contends that **πρεσβύτερος** is to be taken in its ordinary sense of ‘older,’ and that it was applied to the person mentioned by Papias either because he was the senior of St. John, or because he arrived before him in Asia Minor; but this is improbable in itself; and, had Papias meant to intimate this, he would not have simply called him **ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης** (see Liddon, p. 514). In his statement **πρεσβύτερος** is plainly opposed to **ἀπόστολος** as a distinctive title of office” (Kitto, *Cycop.* s.v.). We cannot close without permitting Dr. Schaff (*Apost. Ch. Hist.* p. 421 sq.) to give his view on this important question. He says: “There is room even to inquire whether the very existence of this obscure presbyter and mysterious duplicate of the apostle John rests not upon sheer misunderstanding, as Herder suspected (*Offenb. Joh.* p. 206, in the 12th vol. of Herder’s *Werke zur Theol.*). We candidly avow that to us, notwithstanding what Lücke (iv, 396 sq.) and Credner (*Einleit. in’s N.Test.* 1, 694 sq.) have said in its favor, this man’s existence seems very doubtful. The only proper, original testimony for it is, as is well known, an obscure passage of Papias in Eusebius, 3, 39.” After doubting the propriety of giving credit to a statement of Papias not reiterated by any other authority of the early Church, he says: “It is very possible that Papias meant in both cases one and the same John, and repeated his name perhaps on account of his peculiarly close contact with him. (See above, Dr. Alexander’s view.) So Irenaeus, at least, seems to have understood him, when he calls Papias a disciple of the *apostle* John (without mentioning any presbyter of that name) and friend of Polycarp (*Adv. Hoer.* 5, 33). The arguments for this interpretation are the following:

(1) The term ‘presbyter’ is here probably not an official title, but denotes age, including the idea of venerableness, as also Credner supposes (p. 697), and as may be inferred from ~~600b~~2 John 1 and ~~600b~~3 John 1, and from the

usage of Irenaeus, who applies the same term to his master Polycarp (*Adv. Hoer.* 5, 30), and to the Roman bishops before Soter (5, 24). This being so, we cannot conceive how a contemporary of John, bearing the same name, should be distinguished from the apostle by this standing title, since the apostle himself had attained an unusual age, and was probably even sixty when he came to Asia Minor.

(2) Papias, in the same passage, styles the other apostles also ‘presbyters,’ the ancients, the fathers; and, on the other hand, calls also Aristion and John (personal) ‘disciples of the Lord.’

(3) The evangelist designates himself as ‘the elder’ (2 John 1 and 3 John 1), which leads us to suppose that he was frequently so named by his ‘little children,’ as he loves to call his readers in his first epistle. For this reason also it would have been altogether unsuitable, and could only have created confusion, to denote by this title another John, who lived with the apostle and under him in Ephesus. Credner supposes, indeed, that these two epistles came not from the apostle, but, like the Apocalypse, from the ‘presbyter John’ in question. But it is evident at first sight that these epistles are far more akin, even in their language, to the first epistle than to the Apocalypse (comp. Ⲁⲓⲃ 2 John 47 with Ⲁⲓⲃ 1 John 2:7, 8; 4:2, 3; Ⲁⲓⲃ 2 John 9 with Ⲁⲓⲃ 1 John 2:27; 3:9, etc.). This is De Wette’s reason for considering them genuine. When Credner supposes that the presbyter afterwards accommodated himself to the apostle’s way of thinking and speaking, he makes an entirely arbitrary assumption which he himself condemns in pronouncing a like change in the apostle ‘altogether unnatural and inadmissible’ (p. 733).

(4) The Ephesian bishop Polycrates, of the 2d century, in his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, on the Paschal controversy (in Euseb. 5, 24), mentions but one John, though he there enumerates the μεγάλα στοιχεῖα of the Asian Church, Philip, with his pious daughters, Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papiarius, Melito, most of whom were not so important as the presbyter John must have been if he were a personal disciple of the Lord, and the author of the Apocalypse. We can hardly think that in this connection, where it was his object to present as many authorities as possible for the Asiatic usage respecting the feast, Polycrates would have passed over this John if he had known anything about him, and if his tomb could have been really pointed out in Ephesus, as the later Dionysius and Jerome intimate. Jerome, however, in speaking of this, expressly observes,

‘Nonnulli putant, duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelists esse’ (*De Vir. Ill.* c. 9); which, again, makes this whole story doubtful, and destroys its character as a historical testimony in favor of this obscure presbyter.”

Ridiculous, certainly, is the argument which some have advanced, that the different Johannean epistles differ so much in style that they cannot possibly be ascribed to one and the same person. On this argument Ebrard (*Einleitung*) laid particular stress, but he is ably answered by Dr. Tholuck in his *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangel. Geschichte*, 2d ed. p. 283. From the rich treasury of his reading the latter draws such analogies as the “varietas dictionis Appulejanae;” the difference between the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* and the *Annales* of Tacitus; between the *Leges* and the earlier dialogues of Plato; the sermons and the satires of Swift, etc. “This catalogue,” says Dr. Schaff, “may easily be increased from the history of modern literature. Think, for example, of the immense distance between Schleiermacher’s *Roden über die Religion* and his *Dialektik*; Hegel’s *Logik* and *Aesthetik*; the first and second part of Goethe’s *Faust*; Carlyle’s *Life of Schiller* and his *Latter-day Pamphlets*, etc.” Comp. also Liddon, *Divinity of Christ*, p. 512 sq. **SEE JOHN, SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF.**

John, Prester

(*Priest John*), a supposed Christian king and priest of a medieval kingdom in the interior of Asia, the locality of which is vague and undefined. In the 11th and 12th centuries the Nestorian missionaries penetrated into Eastern Asia, and made conversions among the Keraeit or Krit Tartars, which, according to the earliest reports, are said to have included the khan or sovereign of the tribe. Ung (or Ungh) Khan, who resided at Karakorum, and to whom the afterwards celebrated Genghis Khan was tributary. This name the Syrian missionaries translated by analogy with their own language. converting *Ung* into “Jachanan” or “John,” and rendering *Khan* by “priest.” In their reports to the Christians of the West, accordingly, their royal convert figured as at once a priest and the sovereign of a rich and magnificent kingdom. Genghis Khan having thrown off his allegiance, a war ensued, which ended in the defeat and death of Ung Khan in 1202; but the tales of his piety and magnificence long survived, and not only furnished the material of numberless medieval legends (which may be read in Assemani’s *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 3, 2, 484), but supplied the occasion of several of those missionary expeditions from Western Christendom to which we owe almost all our knowledge of medieval Eastern geography.

The reports regarding Ung Khan, carried to Europe by two Armenian legates in 1145 to Eugene III, created a most profound impression; and the letters addressed in his name, but drawn up by the Nestorian missionaries, to the pope, to the kings of France and Portugal, and to the Greek emperor, impressed all with a lively hope of the speedy extension of the Gospel in a region hitherto regarded as hopelessly lost to Christianity. They are printed in Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. The earliest mention of Prester John is in the narrative of the Franciscan father John Carpini, who was sent by pope Innocent IV to the court of Batu Khan of Kiptchak, the grandson of Genghis Khan. Father Carpini supposed that Prester John's kingdom lay still further to the east, but he did not prosecute the search. This was reserved for a member of the same order, father Rubruquis, who was sent as a missionary into Tartary by St. Louis, and, having reached the camp of Batu Khan, was by him sent forward to Karakorum, the seat of the supposed Prester John. He failed, however, of his hope of finding such a personage, the Khagan of Karakorum, Mangu, being still an unbeliever; and his intercourse with the Nestorian missionaries whom he found established there satisfied him that the accounts were grievously exaggerated. His narrative, which is printed in Purchas's *Collection*, is one of the most interesting among those of medieval travellers. Under the same vague notion of the existence of a Christian prince and a Christian kingdom in the East, the Portuguese sought for traces of Prester John in their newly-acquired Indian territory in the 15th century. A similar notion prevailed as to the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia, which, in the hope of finding Prester John, was visited so late as the reign of John II of Portugal (1481-95) by Pedro Covilham and Alfonzo di Palva, the former of whom married and settled in the country. See Gieseler's *Kirchengeschichte*, 3, 3, 43; Ritter's *Erdkeldle von Asien*, 1, 283 sq.; Schmidt, *Forschungen im Gebiete d. alteren Bildungsgesch. d. Mongolen und Tubeter* (Petersb. 1824), p. 162.

John Pupper.

SEE GOCH.

John Pungens Asinum.

SEE JOHN OF PARIS.

John Raithuensis

or RAITHENUS, i.e. of *Raithus* or *Raitku* (τοῦ ῚΡαίθοῦ), begumendos or abbot of a monastery at Elim, or the Seventy Springs, on the western coast of the peninsula of Mount Sinai, flourished in the 6th century. He is celebrated on account of the friendly relations he sustained and the influence he exerted over John the Scholar, or John Climacus. It was at the desire of Raithuensis that Climacus wrote the work **Κλίμαξ** or *Scala Paradisi*, from which he derives his name, and to which Raithuensis wrote a *Commendatio* and *Scholia*. The **Ἐπιστολή τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἠγουμένου τοῦ Ραίθοῦ** *Litteroe Joannis Raithuensis*, addressed to Climacus, requesting him to undertake the work, and the answer of Climacus are given by Raderus in the original Greek, with a Latin version, in his edition of the works of Climacus (Paris, 1633, fol.). This version of the *Litteroe* of Raithuensis, and a Latin version of his *Commendatio* and *Scholia*, are given in various editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*: the *Litteroe* in vol. 3, edit. Paris, 1575; the *Litteroe and Commendatio*, vol. 5. edit. Paris, 1589 and 1654; the *Litterce, Epistola, Commendatio*, and *Scholia*, in vol. 6, pt. 2, ed. Cologne, 1618, and vol. 10, ed. Lyme, 1677. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 9, 523-524; Ittigius, *De Biblioth. Patrum*. — *Smith, Dict. Gr.s and Rom. Biog.* 2, 601.

John Of Ravena.

SEE NICHOLAS I; SEE RAVENNA.

John The Recluse.

SEE JOHN NICIOTA.

John De La Rochelle,

a French theologian, was born in the early part of the 13th century, probably in the city of La Rochelle. He joined the Franciscans, and studied under Alexander de Hales, whom he succeeded in 1238, but resigned in 1253 in favor of St. Bonaventura. He died at Paris in 1271, according to Luc Wadding. John de la Rochelle was a successful teacher, yet his works did not enjoy much renown, probably because he did not follow the mystical tendency of the times. Among his works we notice commentaries on a number of the books of the Bible; sermons, preserved in the MS. collections of divers libraries, chiefly in that of Troyes, France; *De Anima*,

MSS. in the library of St. Victor; and he is also considered the author of some other works, but on doubtful grounds. He is especially deserving of notice as one of the first, if not the first who attempted to explain Aristotle's *Περὶ ψυχῆς*, a task of which he ably disposed. Thomas Aquinas probably availed himself of this work. See Cas. Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.*; *Histoire Litt. de la France*, 19, 171; B, Haureau, *De la Philosophie Scolastique*, 1, 475; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 26, 548. (J. N.P.)

John Of Rupescissa

or ROQUETAILLADÉ, a French Franciscan, who flourished near the middle of the 14th century, at Aurillac, in Auvergne, is noted for his severe denunciations of the gross immoralities of the clergy of the Roman Church in his day. He was especially opposed to the court at Avignon, and hesitated not to brand the whole papal court as the seat of a great whoredom. Popes Clement VI and Innocent VI imprisoned him on account of his continued remonstrances and prophesying, but even while in prison he wrote much against the papal court and the clergy. He died while in prison, but the cause of his death is not known. His works of interest are,

(1) *Vademecum in tribulatione* (in Ed. Brown's addition to *Orturii Gratii fascic. rer. expectandar. et fugientdar.* London, 1690), wherein he handles the French clergy without gloves, and prophesies much trouble to their native land on account of their sins: —

(2) A Commentary on the prophecies of the hermit Cyril of Mount Carmel and of abbot Joachim (q.v.). See Trithemius, *De script. Eccles.* 100, 611 (in Fabricius, *Bib. Eccl.* pt. 2, p. 145); Wolfius, *Lectt. memorab.* cent. 14, p. 623 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handw. der Kirchengesch.* 2, 482; Aschbach, *Kirch.-Lex.* 3, 565. (J.H.W.)

John Of Salisbury,

an eminent English prelate, was born at Salisbury (old *Sarum*) about 1110. He was first educated at Oxford, and in 1136 went to France, where he continued his studies under Abelard, and many other celebrated French divines of that age. About 1151 he returned to England, and was appointed chaplain of Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury. Sent on a mission to pope Hadrian IV in 1156, he openly approached the latter on the abuses of the Church and of the papacy, though always an earnest advocate of the unity

and liberty of the Church, and the independence of the episcopate from the secular princes. He was an intimate friend and admirer of Thomas a Becket, whose cause he espoused warmly, and whom he followed into exile returning only to England with him in 1170, and after his death secured his canonization. John was called Becket's eye and arm. In 1176 he was appointed bishop of Chartres, and died about 1180. His works, which evince positive Realistic tendencies, and bear evidence of fruitful genius, sound understanding, and great erudition, are, *Policraticus s. de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum* (Leyden, 1691) (an excellent treatise on the employments, duties, virtues, and vices of great men — a curious and valuable monument of the literature of John of Salisbury's time): — *Metaloquicus* (Leyd. 1610, Amst. 1664), an exhibition of true and false science; — *Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum* (pub. by Chr. Petersen, Hamb. 1843): — *Vita ac Passio S. Thomae* (a Life of Thomas a Becket), etc. His collective works have been published by J. A. Giles (Lond. 1848, 5 vols. 8vo). See H. Reuter, *J. von Salisbury* (Berl. 1842); J. Schmidt, *Joan Parv. Sarisb.*, etc. (1838); *Hist. Litt. de la France*, etc., 14, 89 sq.; Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philos.* 7, 605; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v. **SEE BECKET**; **SEE PAPACY**.

John III.

the patriarch, surnamed THE SCHOLAR (1), was born at Sirimis, near Antioch, towards the middle of the 6th century. He became successively attorney, then presbyter of Antioch, and finally, in 565, patriarch of Constantinople under Justinian I. He died in 577. He prepared a large *Collectio canonum* under fifty headings, which became authoritative in the whole Greek Church. He is also considered as the author of a collection of ecclesiastical rules and regulations under the title *Nomocanon* (both in Justelli, *Biblioth. juris canonici* [Paris, 1662], 2, 499, 603, 660). He is also said to have delivered a dissertation on the doctrine of the Trinity which involved him in a controversy with the renowned so-called Tritheist John Philoponus (Phot. *Cod.* 75).

John The Scholar (2)

(JOHANNES SCHOLASTICUS or CLIMACUS). a monk of the latter half of the 6th century, was a zealous partisan of monastic life, and became abbot of a convent on Mount Sinai. He died there about 606. He wrote **Κλίμαξ τοῦ παραδείσου**, an ascetic mystical work (Latin, *Scala paradisi*, Ambrosius,

Venice, 1531, etc.), which was greatly celebrated and widely circulated among Greek monks for centuries after his *death*: — *Liber ad religiosum postorem, qui est de officio coenobiarchoe* (publ. by Matth. Rader, 1606). A collection of his works in Greek and Latin has been published by Matth. Rader (Paris, 1633). — Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* s.v.

John Scotus Erigena.

SEE SCOTUS.

John Of Scythopolis,

a Greek ecclesiastical writer, who in all probability flourished in the latter part of the 5th century or the beginning of the 6th, wrote a work against the followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus, entitled **Κατὰ τῶν ἀποσχιστῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας**, *Contra desertores ecclesoe*. It was divided into twelve parts, and was undertaken at the suggestion of a certain prelate, one Julianus, in reply to an anonymous Eutychian writer, who had published a book deceitfully entitled **Κατὰ Νεστορίων**, *Adversus Nestorium*, and whom Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 95, 107) supposed to be Basilius, a presbyter of Cilicia. This Basilius wrote a reply to John in very abusive style, charging him, among many other things, with being a Manichaeon, and with restricting Lent to a period of three weeks, and not abstaining from flesh even in that shortened period. Certain **Παραθέσεις**, *Scholia*, to the works of the *pseudo Dionysius Areopagita*, which Usher has observed to be mingled in the printed editions of Dionysius with *the Scholia of St. Maximus*, have been ascribed to John of Scythopolis. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, in the 8th century, made a Latin translation of these mingled scholia, not now extant, in which he professed to distinguish those of Maximus from those of John by the mark of a cross. Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* 7, 9; 10, 707, 710) identifies *the Scholia of John* with the *Commentarii in Dionysium Areopagitam* cited by John Cyparissiota as by Dionysius of Alexandria. See Usher, *Dissert. de Scriptis Dionys. Areop. suppositis*, p. 299, subjoined to his *Historia Dogmatica de Scriptoris Vernaculis*, etc. (London, 1689, 4to); Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1, 466. — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 602.

John Of Talaia

or TALAIDA (otherwise *Tabennisiota*, **Ταβεννισιώτης**, from the monastery of Tabenna, near Alexandria; or of *Alexandria*, from his

patriarchal see; or from the offices which he had previously held, *oekonomus* [οἰβεννισιότης] and *presbyter*), a celebrated ecclesiastic in the Eastern Church, was one of the deputation sent by Salofaciolus, the twenty-seventh patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 460-482), shortly before his decease; to the emperor Zeno, to secure his leave for a free election of the next patriarch from among the defenders of the Council of Chalcedon by the clergy and laity of Alexandria. "The emperor," says Neale (*East. Church [Alexand.]* 2, 18), "received the deputies graciously, complied with their request, and in the letter which he gave them by way of reply *spoke strongly in favor of John.*" Soon after the return of John, Timotheus Salofaciolus died, and John was unanimously elected to succeed him, but was almost immediately expelled from his see by order of the emperor. The cause of his expulsion is differently stated. Liberatus says that he was expelled mainly through the jealousy of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, to whom, on different occasions, he had failed in paying due attention. According to Evagrius, who quotes Zacharias as his authority, he was detected in having procured his own election by bribery, and had broken an oath which he had taken before Zeno not to seek for himself the patriarchate. But Neale thinks it doubtful whether John ever took such an oath, and holds that, even if he had, he can see no reason for the harshness with which he was treated, and for his ejection from the see, so long as it was freely proffered to him (which seems clear from the *unanimous election*). The true reason seems to be John's careless delay of the announcement of his election to the patriarch of Constantinople, sending the message by Illus, who was then in Antioch, instead of dispatching a messenger direct, as he had done in the case of Rome and Antioch, thereby provoking the patriarch of Constantinople, also his selection of Illus for the messenger, when the latter was then the object of jealousy and suspicion to Zeno, if not actually in rebellion against him. John, expelled from Alexandria, first resorted to Illus, then to Antioch; and having, through Illus's intervention, obtained from the patriarch of Antioch and his suffragans a synodical letter commending him to pope Simplicius, departed to Rome to plead his cause there in person. Simplicius, with the usual papal jealousy of the patriarchs of Constantinople, took the side of John; but neither the exertions of Simplicius nor those of his successor Felix could obtain the restoration of the banished patriarch, and John finally accepted from Felix the bishopric of Nola, in Campania, which he held several years, and at last died peaceably (the precise date of his decease is not known). John (whom Theophanes extols for his piety and orthodoxy)

wrote *Πρὸς Γελάσιον τὸν Ῥώμης ἀπολογία*, *Ad Gelasium Papam Apologia*, in which he anathematized Pelagianism, as well as its defenders Pelagius and Celestius, and their successor Julianus. The work, which is noticed by Photius, is not extant. See Tillemont, *Mfmn.* vol. 16; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1, 445. — Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 602; Neale, *Hist. East. Ch. (Alex.)* 2, 18 sq.

John, Surnamed The Teuton,

from his nationality, abbot of St. Victor, was a native of the diocese of Treves. He studied at Paris, joined the canon regulars of St. Victor, and became their abbot in 1203. He was one of the ablest of the *glossatores* (q.v.) on canon law, and appears to have exerted great influence in general over the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and to have been in great favor both with the pope and with the king of France. He died at Paris Nov. 28, 1229. He left thirty-seven sermons, which are preserved among the MSS. of the Imperial Library at Paris. (Two Dominican Monks of like name flourished in the latter half of the 13th and the first half of the 14th century.) See (esaire d'Heisterbah, *Illustr. Mirac. et Histoire Memor.* lib 6, c., 12; Jacques de Vitry, *Hist. Occidental.* c. 24; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 18, 67; *Gallia Christ.* vol. 10, col. 673; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 26, 547.

John, Archbishop Of Thessalonica,

who flourished in the 7th century, is noted as a stout defender of the orthodox faith against the Monothelites. He attended as papal legate the third Constantinopolitan (sixth ecumenical) Council (A.D. 680), and in that character subscribed the Acta of the council (*Concilia*, vol. 6, col. 1058, ed. Labbe; vol. 3, col. 1425, ed. Hardouin; vol. 11 col. 639, ed. Iansi.). The time of his death is altogether uncertain. He wrote

(1) *Εἰς τὰς μυροφόρους γυναῖκας*, *In mulieres ferentes unguenta*, a discourse or treatise in which he argues that there is no contradiction in the several accounts of the resurrection of Christ given by the four evangelists. This piece appears to have been regarded by some as a work of Chrysostom, and was first published (but from a mutilated and corrupt text) by Savile in his edition of Chrysostom (5, 740, Eton. 1610, fol.), though with an expression of doubt as to its genuineness. It was subsequently printed more correctly in the *Novum Auctarium* of Combefis (vol. 1, Paris, 1648, folio), and by him assigned to the right author. It is

given in a mutilated form in Montfaucon's edition of Chrysostom among the *Spuria*, 8, 159 (Paris, 1718, ol.), or in 8, 816 of the 8vo reprint (Paris, 1839). It is also given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Gallandius, 13, 185, etc. A Latin version is given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol 12 (Lyons, 1677): —

(2) **Λόγος**, *Oratio*, of which a considerable extract was read by Nicolaus, bishop of Cyzicus, at the second Nicene (seventh, ecumenical) Council, and is printed in the *Concilia*, vol. 7, col. 353, ed. Labbe: vol. 4, col. 292, ed. Hardouin; vol. 13, col. 163, ed. Mansi; and by Gallandius in his *Bibliotheca Patrum*, 13, 196. See Give, *Hist. Litt.* 1; 597; Fabricius. *Bibl. Graec.* 10, 250. — Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 603.

John Of Turrecremata.

SEE TURRECREMATA.

John Of Wesel.

SEE WESEL.

John Of Wessel.

SEE WESSEL.

John I, Pope Of Rome,

a Tuscan by birth, ascended the papal throne Aug. 13, 523. About this time the bigoted Eastern emperor Justus II had issued an edict against heretics of all denominations, commanding them to be put to death wherever found in his dominions; but, as it was principally aimed against the detested Manichaeans, all went well until, in 524, the emperor issued another edict, this time against the Arians of Italy. Their patron Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, was induced to intercede for them in Byzantium, and he dispatched an embassy for this purpose, headed by the orthodox pope John himself, who had thus to plead a cause for which he had no sympathy. The latter promised, in undertaking the mission, to procure the revocation of the edict and in this he succeeded, but, failing to procure also the emperor's permission for all those who had forsaken Arianism unwillingly to return to their former faith, and Theodoric fearing that the whole work on the part of the pope was a piece of deception, and that the Romans, with the bishop at their head instead of seeking relief from the intolerance

of Greek orthodoxy, solicited aid against the Goths, imprisoned the pope on his arrival at Ravenna, where he died May 18, 526. A Roman tradition reports, not without some complacency, that in Constantinople the emperor bowed down before the bishop of Rome, and that at high mass the seat of the latter, by his special request, was raised above that of the patriarch; seemingly, of course, a concession of superiority to the Roman see. John is numbered among the martyrs. Two letters are ascribed to him by Baronius and others, but they are now generally rejected. See Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 2, 312 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, 1, 199.

John II,

Pope, a Roman by birth, surnamed *Mercurius*, succeeded Boniface II in the Roman see in 532, being elected by the clergy and the people of Rome after considerable agitation and many simoniacal practices, and confirmed by king Athalaric, for which confirmation a certain payment was fixed by an edict of the same king. The emperor Justinian, in a letter addressed to him shortly after his accession, after earnest assurances of his endeavor to unite the Western and Eastern churches, makes full confession of superior power belonging to the Roman hierarchy, designating him as “the head of the holy Church.” The only other important events in his life are his decision on the Trinity question in favor of Justinian (q.v.) *SEE ACOEMETAE* and in the case of othe bishop of Riez (q.v.). He died in 535. See Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 2, 333 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, 1, 203.

John III

Pope, a native of Rome, was elected to succeed Pelagius I in 560, and was confirmed by the exarch of Ravenna in the name of the emperor Justinian. Like many of his predecessors, he used his powers mainly for the aggrandizement of the Roman see. He is noted for his interference in behalf of the two French bishops of Embrun and of Gap, who had been deposed by local councils for improper conduct. Though known to be guilty, he ordered their restoration, which Gontram, the Burgundian king, was only too happy to enforce in opposition to the French clergy. But the Gallican Church, which had with very great hesitancy permitted the restoration of the guilty men, soon proved them to be unworthy of ecclesiastical office, and a new French council confirmed their previous deposition. John died in 574. See Riddle, *Papacy*, 1, 210; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 2, 426 sq.

John IV

Pope, a Dalmatian by birth, was consecrated Dec. 25, 640. He displayed great zeal in founding convents and endowing the churches of Rome. But he is noted especially for his strife against his Greek rival. The Monothelite creed of the patriarch Sergius, promulgated by the emperor Herodius as ἕκθεσις, was denounced by John as heresy, and condemned by a Roman synod A.D. 641. John defended Honorius from the charge made by the Eastern Church that he was guilty of the Monothelite heresy, and Eutychius informs us that, before his death (Oct. 12, 642), the emperor Constans gave John IV the promise of withdrawing the ἕκθεσις, but the controversy continued under his successors. See Bower, *History of the Popes*, 3, 24 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 754.

John V

Pope, a native of Syria, elevated to the papal dignity in May or July, 685, hardly ever left the bed during the short time of his insignificant pontificate. The authenticity of the letters assigned to him, and of the book *De dignitate pallii*, has been contested. He died Aug. 2, 686.

John VI and VII

Popes, both Greeks by birth, were quite insignificant occupants of the papal throne. The former was consecrated October 10, 701, and buried January 10, 705. He was defended by Roman soldiers against the exarch Theophylact, who was ordered to drive him from the apostolic see. In a council which he held at Rome he acquitted Wilfred, archbishop of York, of several charges brought against him by the English clergy. The latter (consecrated March 1, 705, buried Oct. 18, 707) is described as weak and spiritless. The happiest illustration of the weakness of the Roman see at this time is afforded us in the action of this pope, who did not dare to venture to express an opinion on the Trullan canon, submitted to his examination by the emperor Justinian II, for fear of giving offence to somebody; and we do not wonder that an able ecclesiastical writer of our day (Butler, in his *Ch. History*, 1, 359) says that the whole period from Gregory I to Gregory II “may be briefly designated as that in which the popes were under subjection to the emperors of the East and their lieutenants, the exarchs of Ravenna.” See the *Vite* in Anastasius; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 3, 159 sq., 167 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, 1, 305 sq.

John VIII

Pope (styled the ninth by those who believed in the story of pope Joan [q.v.], whom they style *John VIII*), a native of Rome, succeeded Adrian II Dec. 14, 872. He displayed much tact, and harbored great schemes, but was destitute of noble motives, and the spirit displayed during his administration is in keeping with the ideas of the pseudo-Isidorian collection, to which his predecessor Nicholas I had first ventured to appeal. John's designs, however, found but a tardy response in the little minds with which he had to deal, and the prevalence of general anarchy was not more auspicious to their execution. The pope, as well as the clergy, in the strife after power, actuated only by worldly ambition, knew no other arms than cunning and intrigue, and with these they were neither able to control the rude powers which sapped the foundations of the Carolingian monarchy, nor to erect on its ruins the fabric of ecclesiastical dominion. When Louis II died, 875, without an heir to his land and crown, Charles the Bald marched hastily into Italy, and took possession of the Italian dominions. Then he proceeded to Rome, and accepted (Christmas, 875), as a boon of the chair of St. Peter, the imperial crown, to which he had no lawful claim. Some Church annalists claim that the two then entered into a compact by which the emperor ceded to the pope the absolute and independent government of Rome, a confirmation and amplification of Pepin's donation; but documental proof (and that of an ambiguous kind) can be deduced only for the surrender of Capua (compare Mansi, *Concil.* 17, 10). By this alliance not much was directly gained by either party, for Charles, having once secured his coronation, cared but little for the papal interests; "yet eventually the manner in which Charles had become possessed of the empire and of Italy increased very materially the papal power, especially when, in a moment of fear for his throne, Charles the Bald suffered the pope to declare that to him had been intrusted the imperial diadem by the only power on earth that could claim its disposal the vicar of Rome." 'The emperor,' however, failed to protect the papal dominions from the attacks of the Saracens. It is true he at one time led an army against the infidels (877), but his sudden death cut off all further hope of relief, especially after Athanlsius's (bishop-duke of Naples) double-handed game of pleasing the pope and forming alliances with the Saracens became known at Rome, and we do not wonder that the plundering of Campania and the exactions of John make Milman say of the pope's difficulties from this score that "the whole pontificate of John VIII was a long, if at times interrupted, agony of

apprehension lest Rome should fall into the hands of the unbeliever” (*Latin Christianity*, 3, 84). Much more precarious became the condition of the Roman pontiff after the death of Charles the Bald, whose son and successor in the West Frank dominion, Louis the Hammerer, engaged in warfare with the Normans, found himself neither in a position to be an aspirant for the imperial crown, nor to afford assistance to the vicar of Christendom. The only one from whom the pope really received any assurances of succor was Carloman, who at this time, with an army in Upper Italy, and just recognised as king at Pavia, was aiming at the imperial throne against the French line. But, finding the pope more favorably inclined towards the French, he suddenly departed, and left to his nobles the disposition of the pope’s case. Lambert, duke of Spoleto, and Adelbert, count of Tuscany, immediately made themselves masters of Rome, and, after imprisoning the pope, compelled the clergy and the nobles to swear allegiance to Carloman. But no sooner had Rome been cleared of Carloman’s friends than the pope himself set out for France, determined no longer to conceal his desire to create for himself an emperor whom all the world should recognise as absolutely indebted for the crown to the see of Rome only. Arrived in France, the pope made Provence his refuge. Everywhere he was received with great respect, but especial deference was paid him by one Boso duke of Lombardy, connected with the imperial house by marriage, possessed of great influence and wealth, and an aspirant for the imperial purple. He succeeded in winning the good graces of the Roman pontiff, and was designated for the vacant throne (comp. the letter in Mansi, 17, 121). Boso was, however, only made king of Burgundy, as Charles the Fat proved too fast for the pope; he had marched with a preponderating force into Italy, and the pope, foreseeing that the prince would not be likely to await his decision as to the rights of the Carolingians to the throne, hastened to meet him at Ravenna, and reluctantly (though contriving to avoid the appearance of constraint) placed the crown upon the head of Charles the Fat. But, if John failed in placing upon the throne his own favorite, he certainly succeeded even now in exalting, as he had done under Charles the Bald, the pope above the emperor. To this, as well as to his efforts to make the clergy independent of the temporal princes, may be ascribed his popularity as a pope, and the magnificent reception he enjoyed on his visit to France. “At the Council of Ravenna in 877, and again at another at Troyes, which he convened in the following year, during his stay in France, he propounded several decrees, to the astonishment of the bishops themselves, claiming for them various

rights and privileges which they had not themselves hitherto ventured to demand. This proceeding produced upon their minds the greater impression, inasmuch as they had long been desirous of advancing their social position. Never until now had they been made aware of the points at which they ought to aim in order to secure for themselves the highest rank and influence in the state, and the pontiff who gave them powerful assistance in this weighty affair could not but be highly popular among them. It was perhaps by this measure that John principally contributed to the strengthening of the papacy to such an extent that it remained without any considerable loss during a long succession of unworthy, or impotent and inactive popes, who occupied and disgraced the see during the troubles which shook Italy for more than half a century” (Riddle, *Papacy*, 2, 31, 32). The controversy with the Eastern Church on the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria was continued under John. At first he inclined to favor Photius (q.v.), and acknowledged him as patriarch of Constantinople, but he was afterwards obliged to excommunicate him, as the Latin party severely condemned his course. Ffoulkes (*Christendom's Division*, 2, p. 7) says that the fable of pope Joan must have originated with the Latin party of this time, and that it was aimed against John VIII, “not because his theology was defective, or his life immoral, or his rule arbitrary, but solely because he had had the courage, the *manliness*, to appreciate the abilities and desire to cultivate the friendship of the great patriarch his brother.” But his excommunication of Photius was by no means the only one he pronounced. Indeed, “no pope was more prodigal of excommunication than John VIII. Of his letters, above 300 (found in Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 16), it is remarkable how large a proportion threaten, inflict, or at least allude to this last exercise of sacerdotal power” (Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, 3, 92 sq.). John found his death, as the *Annales Fuldenses* relate, through a conspiracy of his own curia. The assassins first tried poison; when this did not operate quick enough, they slew him with a hammer, Dec. 15, 882. See Milman, *Lat. Christ.* bk. 50 ch. 3; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 5, 36 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, 2, 27 sq.; Reichel, *Rom. See in the Middle Ages*, p. 109 sq.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 2, 347; Giesebrecht, *Gesch. der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 1, 139 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 754; Muratori, *Scriptt.* 3, pt. 3. (J.H.W.)

John IX

Pope, a Benedictine of Tivoli, was consecrated to the pontifical office June, 898. He held two councils, one at St. Peter's, where the wrong done to his

badly-abused predecessor Formosus was redressed; the other at Ravenna, which passed an act for the better protection of Church property against thieves and incendiaries. John displayed an honest zeal in defending the rights and regulating the discipline of the Church. His rival for the papal throne, Sergius (q.v.), he successfully combated, and, by authority of a council he had called, excommunicated him, with several other ecclesiastical accessories. John died July, 900. On his life, see Muratori, vol. 3, pt. 2; on the synods, Mansi, vol. 18. See also Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 3, 112 sq.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 5, 77 sq.

John X

Pope, according to Liutprand (discredited by Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 3, 163), owed his promotion in ecclesiastical offices to the dissolute Theodora (q.v.), who, attracted by his handsome figure, made him successively archbishop of Bologna, Ravenna, and finally pope (May 15, 914). The profligacy of his times, especially in Rome, surpassed that of the most degenerate period of paganism. The popes were merely the contemptible creatures of the Roman nobility. But, if the archbishop of Ravenna was not a fit example of piety or holiness to be selected for the spiritual head of Christendom, "he appears," says Milman (*Latin Christianity*, 3, 161), "to have been highly qualified for the secular part of his office." He was a man of ability and daring, eminently needed at this juncture to save Rome from becoming the prey of Mohammedan conquest. The Saracens from Africa, who had landed in Italy and fortified themselves near the banks of the Liris, had made frequent irruptions into the Roman territory. At first John contented himself with inciting the neighboring dukes to come to his defense; but, finding the aid of the two emperors necessary to combat successfully the Mohammedans, he crowned Berenger emperor of the West, March 24, 916, and, after having united all forces previously at his command with Berenger and the dukes of Benevento and Naples, he marched in person against them, and completely routed and exterminated them. After a reign of fourteen years, this powerful prelate of Rome came to a miserable end by the legitimate consequences of the same vices that had been instrumental in raising him to his high dignity. Marozia, the daughter of Theodora, anxious to secure for herself and her lover the government of Rome, and finding John too much in their way, surprised him in the Lateran palace, and thrust him into a prison, where, some months after, he died, either of want or by some more summary means

(A.D. 929). Comp. Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 5, 90 sq. Hoier, *Die deutschen Pabste*, 1, 18; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* 3, 158 sq. (J.H.W.)

John XI

Pope, a natural son of Marozia, and, in all probability, of pope Sergius III, was seated on St. Peter's chair by his mother, in whose hands rested at this time (931) the power to supply any vacancies in the papal chair. Of course spiritual government was by such people not in consideration; in fact, Rome was now by all Christendom detested like a pestiferous swamp. "Marozia, not content with having been the wife of a marquis, the wife of a wealthy and powerful duke of Tuscany, perhaps the mistress of one, certainly the mother of another pope, looked still higher in her lustful ambition; she must wed a monarch. To the king of Italy her hand was offered, and by him accepted. But if the Romans had brooked the rule of a Roman woman, they would not so readily consent for her paramour, a foreigner, to rule over them, and, headed by Marozia's own son Alberic, the nobles put an end to the government of Marozia (and Hugh of Provence) and of pope John XI by expelling the former and imprisoning the latter, who died of poison, as is generally supposed, in January, 936. See Milman, *Lat. Christ.* 3, 165 sq.; Du Chesne, *Hist. des Papes*, 2, 460; Aschbach, *Kirchen Lex.* 3, 518; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 5, 96 sq. start

John XII

Pope, a son, of Albeic, and grandson of the profligate and ambitious Marozia, whose vices he seems to have inherited, succeeded to the dignity of Roman patrician upon the death of his father Alberic, and in November, 955, after the death of Agapetus, was elevated to the papal see, though only about sixteen years old. His own name was Octavianus, but as pope he took that of John XII, thus inaugurating the practice which has ever since been followed by the popes of assuming a pontifical name. Ambitious to extend the boundaries of the States of the Church, he soon involved himself in a disastrous war with Berenger II, himself full of ambition, and anxious to become master of Rome. In this most extreme hour of need the pope hesitated not to beseech help from one whom he had formerly declined to receive as worthy of the imperial crown, the emperor Otho I. Daring and indomitable as was the spirit of Otho I, he was no sooner asked by Rome than we find him crossing the Alps with a large army, and, having entered Rome, he secured to the pope not only personal safety, but also

confirmed his title to the States of the Church. The extent of these promises, however, has been subject to controversy, and it is not without a reason that the Vatican record, by which Pepin's donation was confirmed and enlarged, is withheld from critical scrutiny. *SEE PAPACY*. At Pavia, already, Otho had been crowned king of Italy here, at the Eternal City, he received from the pope himself the imperial diadem. "Never did a more important event in history take place, making less impression on those who witnessed it, and less commemorated by subsequent historians, than the coronation of Otho I at Rome in the year 962. By the coronation of Charles 162 years earlier the first foundations had been laid for the empire; by the coronation of Otho that empire itself was founded afresh, and from that time forwards it had an uninterrupted existence" (Reichel. *Rosmai See in the Middle Ages*, p. 124). For a short period the spiritual and temporal heads of Christendom seemed to be happily united, but the fickle John, influenced either by mistrust or jealousy, soon again interrupted that happy concord by concocting anew intrigues with Alberia, the son of Berenger. Rumors of the treacherous conduct of John reached the ears of Otho I, but the noble German would hardly believe the reports until some trustworthy officers whom he had hastily dispatched to Italy pronounced them true. The profligacy and vices of the pope were also reported to Otho I, and the latter determined to return to Rome and depose the vicar, if found guilty of the charges preferred against him. A council composed of the first ecclesiastics of Germany, France, and Italy was quickly called by Otho I, he himself presiding, and the vicar of Christ, accused of the crimes of murder, adultery, and perjury, was summoned to appear in defense. Failing to comply with the emperor's request, judgment was pronounced, and he was deposed and excommunicated Dec. 4, 963, and Leo VIII (q.v.) declared his successor. Hardly had the emperor left Rome when John, supported by the Roman nobility, returned, convened another synod at St. Peter's, and caused it to rescind the resolutions of the former one. Otho I, informed of these outrages, was preparing for a return to Rome for the third time, when John suddenly died of apoplexy while he was engaged in an adulterous intrigue, May 14, 964. "He was a man of most licentious habits, associating with women of every station, and filling the Lateran with the noisy profanity of a brothel." Panvinus, in a note to Platina's account of pope Joan, suggests that the licentiousness of John XII, who, among his numerous mistresses, had one called Joan, who exercised the chief influence at Rome during his pontificate, may have given rise to the story of "pope Joan." Comp. Luitprand, *Historia Ottonis*, in *Monum. Germ.*

Script. vol. 3; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* 3, 175 sq.; Neander, *Ch. History*; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 350; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 121 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, 2, 39 sq. (J.H.W.)

John XIII

Pope, who was made such A.D. 965, was of noble descent, and held, previous to his election, the bishopric of Narni. Provoking the wrath of the Roman nobility on account of his severity, and being a favorite of the imperial party, they instigated a riot against him, and finally secured him as prisoner. The pope, however, effected his escape, and returned to the city about a year after when the emperor himself made his appearance, visiting the disorderly factions of the city with unmitigated severity. After the appointment of a prefect as representative of the imperial power, Otho the Great went to Ravenna; followed by the pope. Here a great and influential council was held, Easter, 967, and fresh guarantees offered to the pontifical chair on all the territory to which it had ever been entitled, including Ravenna. In return for these favors, John crowned the younger Otho (afterwards Otho II) as emperor, and associate king of Germany; also his wife Theophania, the daughter of the Greek emperor. He also evinced his gratefulness by establishing, at the emperor's expressed desire, a mission among the northeastern Slavonians. John died in 972. His few letters are found in Mansi, *Concil. Suppl.* 1, 1142, and Harduin, *Concil.* 6, pt. 1, 639. See Pagi, *Brev. Pontif. R.* 2, 233 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 520; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 757.

John XIV

Pope, who was, previous to his elevation, *Peter*, bishop of Pavia, and archchancellor of the emperor, was elected pope through the influence of Otho II in November or December, 983, in place of Boniface VII (q.v.). Unfortunately, however, his patron died at Rome December 7 of the same year, and the ex-pope, encouraged by the anti-empirical party, ventured to return the following spring (April, 984) from Constantinople, whither he had fled, and proving sufficiently strong to overcome John, his person was secured, and he was imprisoned in the Castle del Angelo, where he was either poisoned or starved to death. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3, 520.

John XV

Pope, who began his inglorious reign in September, 985, was in reality only the puppet of Crescentius, the true governor of Rome, for he presided and ruled at the Castle del Angelo as patricius. At one time John fled to Tuscany, but at the intervention of Otho III he was afterwards permitted to return and to live in the Lateran, but he remained destitute of all authority. By way of compensation for his lack of power, he enriched himself and his relatives with the revenues of the Church. Concerning the dispute about the bishopric of Rheims, see Sylvester II. He died in April, 996.

Some believe that another John, son of the Roman Rupertus, was the fifteenth pontiff under the name of John, and that the present John was the sixteenth pope of that name, holding that he was pope four months after the murder of Boniface VIII; but this is a very dubious statement, and is wholly denied by modern critics. Comp. Willman's *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Otto III*, p. 208, 212; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 520; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 757.

John XVI (or XVII)

Pope, a native of Greece, a Calabrian and bishop of Piacenza, was appointed in 997 by Crescentius, in opposition to Gregory V; but when Otho III, in February, 998, brought Gregory V back to Rome, he imprisoned, mutilated, and ill treated John most shamefully, and put to death Crescentius and his partisans. *SEE GREGORY V*. Though a rival pope, and in office only ten months, John is generally numbered in the series of the popes.

John XVII (or XVIII)

Pope, succeeded Sylvester II in 1003, and died four months after his election.

John XVIII

(or XIX, with the surname *Fasanus*), Pope, succeeded the preceding, and died about 1009. The history of the popes during this period is very obscure, and the chronology confused. He seems to have been on a good footing with the Greek Church, for his name found a place in the great

book of the Constantinopolitan Church. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 521.

John XIX (or XX),

Pope, son of count Gregory of Tuscany, procured the papal throne by violence and bribery after the decease of his brother Benedict VIII, in the year 1024, and died in 1034. He crowned the emperor Conrad, but is especially noted for his imbecility and simoniacal inclinations. The latter so much controlled him that he came very near disposing of the Roman supremacy over the Eastern Church for a pecuniary consideration.

John XX.

SEE JOHN XXI.

John XXI

(who should really have been counted XX), Pope (whose true name was *Petrus Juliani*, cardinal bishop of Tusculum, a native of Lisbon), was elected Sept. 13, 1276. He was a man of learning and honest intentions, but weak, and unable to carry out any honest designs. Whether he is identical with *Petrus Hispanus*, the writer of many medical and philosophical works, is not certain. His efforts to unite the European powers for a crusade were unsuccessful. It is said that he found his death May 16, 1277, at Viterbo, by the falling of a ceiling. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 758.

John XXII

Pope, one of the most celebrated of the pontiffs of Avignon, whose family name was *James de Cahors*, was elected pope in 1316, on the death of Clement V. Attempting to carry out, in very altered circumstances, the vast and comprehensive policy of Gregory VII and Innocent III, John interposed his authority in the contest for the imperial crown in Germany between Louis of Bavaria and Frederick of Austria, by not only espousing the cause of the latter, but even excommunicating his rival. Public opinion, however, and the political relations of the papacy founded upon it, had already begun to change. The people of Germany opposed this policy, and encouraged the Diet of Frankfurt to ignore the papal action, and it was by this body declared that the imperial authority depended upon God alone,

and that the pope had no temporal authority, direct or indirect, within the empire. A long contest ensued, which resulted in his deposition. (See below.) In Italy also he experienced much trouble. The Guelphs or papal party, led by Robert, king of Naples, defeated the Ghibellines, and the pope excommunicated Matteo Visconti, the great leader of that party, and likewise Frederick, king of Sicily. Between Guelphs and Ghibellines, Italy was at that time in a dreadful state of confusion. The pope preached a crusade against Visconti, Cane della Scala, and the Este, as heretics. Robert, with the assistance of the pope, aspired to the dominion of all Italy, and the pope sent a legate, who, at the head of an army, assisted Robert and the other Guelphs against the Ghibellines of Lombardy. But the Ghibellines had clever leaders; Castruccio Castracani, Cane della Scala, and the Visconti kept the fate of the war in suspense until Louis of Bavaria sent troops to their assistance. In 1327 Louis finally came himself to Italy, and, after being crowned at Milan with the iron crown, proceeded to Rome, where the people roused in his favor, drove away the papal legate, and caused Louis to be crowned emperor in St. Peter's by the bishops of Venice and of Aleria. After the coronation, Louis held an assembly in the square before the church, in which he summoned John under his original name, James of Cahors, to appear to answer the charges of heresy and high treason against him. After this mock citation, the emperor proceeded to depose the pope, and to appoint in his stead Peter de Corvara, a monk of Abruzzo, who assumed the name of Nicholas V. Louis also proclaimed a law, which was sanctioned by the people of Rome, to the effect that the pope should reside at Rome, and, if absent more than three months, should be considered as deposed. These measures, however, were attended with little result. Louis returned to Germany, and the Guelphic predominance at Rome was restored, the papal representative resuming his authority. But John XXII never personally visited Rome, having died at Avignon in 1334, when he had accumulated in his coffers the enormous sum of 18,000,000 florins of gold. John is renowned in theological history as the author of that portion of the canon law called the *Extravagantes*, and also for the singular opinion he entertained that the just will not be admitted to the beatific vision until after the general resurrection. This opinion he was obliged formally to retract before his death (see Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 421). Under his pontificate the clergy and people of the towns were deprived of the right of electing their bishops, which right he reserved to himself on payment of certain fees by the person elected. He was especially rapacious in the collection of the Annates, or First Fruits. See

Bower, *History of the Popes*, 6, 413 sq.; Labbe, 15, 147; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

John XXIII

Pope, a native of Naples, and previously to his election known as cardinal *Cossa*, succeeded Alexander V in 1410. A man of great talents, but worthless in character, his reputation as cardinal under his predecessor is by no means enviable. Indeed, he is accused of having *poisoned* Alexander V (q.v.). As a pope, he supported the claims of Louis of Anjou against Ladislaus, king of Naples; but Ladislaus, having defeated his rival in battle, advanced to Rome, and obliged John to flee to Florence. He then preached a crusade against Ladislaus, which gave occasion to denunciations and invectives from John Huss. Meantime the great schism continued, and Gregory, styled XII, and Benedict, antipopes, divided with John the homage of the Christian states. In his exile, wishing to secure the favor of the emperor, he proposed to Sigismund the convocation of a general council to restore peace to the Church, and Sigismund fixed on the city of Constance as the place of assembly. On hearing of the death of Ladislaus, by which event Rome became again open to him, John repented of what he had proposed, but was obliged to comply with the general wish by repairing to Constance. By this council (see vol. 2, p. 486) John was forced to drop the papal tiara; but soon after, by the assistance of Frederick of Austria, he resumed his authority by ordering the council to dissolve. This provoked the question whether the pope is the supreme authority in the Church, and the fourth and fifth sessions decided "that the General Council, once assembled, is superior to the pope, and can receive no orders from him." A formal process was now instituted against John; sixty charges were laid against him, and he was finally deposed on May 29, 1415, and given into the custody of the elector palatine. After the election of Martin V and the termination of the Council of Constance, John, now again Balthazar Cossa, escaped from Germany, and made his submission to the new pope, who treated him kindly, and gave him the first rank among the cardinals. He died soon after, Nov. 22, 1419, at Florence. The name of John, which most of those who bore it disgraced, either by debauchery, simony, or other crimes, has since been avoided by the occupants of the chair of St. Peter. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 759; *Eng. Cyclop.* s.v.; Muratori, *Vitoe*, 3, 2, p. 846 sq.; Riddle. *Papacy*, 2, 353.

John (St.), Christians Of.

SEE SABIANS.

John's (St.) Day

a festival to commemorate the nativity of John the Baptist. It was observed as early as the 4th century. The birth of John is known to have preceded that of Jesus Christ six months, and June 24 is therefore the day fixed upon for this festival. Augustine had commented upon the peculiarity of observing his birthday rather than his martyrdom, and the Church of Rome seems to have acted on this suggestion: for it set aside also a day, namely, August 29, in commemoration of his beheading; but both his birth and martyrdom are celebrated on the same day in the service of the Church of England, the chief passages relating to his life and death being included in the lessons. *SEE JOHNS, EVE OF ST.*

John (ST.) The Evangelist's Day,

the festival in honor of John the beloved disciple, the brother of James. The first trace of this festival, held on December 27, occurs in the writings of "the venerable" Bede. It is presumed that the observance of it at first was only local. The Council of Lyons, A.D. 1240, ordered that it should be perpetually and universally celebrated.

John's, Eve of St.

one of the most joyous festivals of Christendom during the Middle Ages, was celebrated on the eve of the birthday of *John the Baptist* (q.v.). From the account given of it by Jakob Grimm (*Deutsche Mythologie*, 1, 578, 581, 583 sq.), it would appear to have been observed with similar rites in every country of Europe. Fires were kindled chiefly in the streets and market places of the towns, as at Paris, Metz, etc.; sometimes, as at Gernsheim, in the district of Mainz, they were blessed by the parish priest, and prayer and praise offered until they had burned out; but, as a rule, they were secular in their character, and conducted by the laity themselves. The young people leaped over the flames, or threw flowers and garlands into them, with merry shoutings; songs and dances were also a frequent accompaniment. At a comparatively late period the very highest personages took part in these festivities. In England, we are told (see R. Chambers's *Book of Days*, June 24), the people on the Eve of St. John's were

accustomed to go into the woods and break down branches of trees, which they brought to their homes and planted over their doors, amid great demonstrations of joy, to make good the prophecy respecting the Baptist, that many should rejoice in his birth. This custom was universal in England till the recent change in manners. Some of the superstitious notions connected with St. John's Eve are of a highly fanciful nature. The Irish believe that the souls of all people on this night leave their bodies, and wander to the place, by land or sea, where death shall finally separate them from the tenement of clay. It is not improbable that this notion was originally universal, and was the cause of the widespread custom of watching or sitting up awake on St. John's night, for we may well believe that there would be a general wish to prevent the soul from going upon that somewhat dismal ramble. In England, and perhaps in other countries also, it was believed that if any one sat up fasting all night in the church porch he would see the spirits of those who were to die in the parish during the ensuing twelve months come and knock at the church door in the order and succession in which they were to die. We can easily perceive a possible connection between this dreary fancy and that of the soul's midnight ramble. The kindling of the fire, the leaping over or through the flames, and the flower garlands, clearly show that these rites are essentially of heathen origin, and of a sacrificial character. They are obviously connected with the sun and fire worship of the ancient heathen nations, particularly the Arians (comp. Agni, of the Hindus [q.v.]; Mittera, of the Persians; the vestal virgins, and the Roman festival of Palila), and the Celts, Germans, and Slavi. In old heathen. times, Midsummer and Yule (q.v.), the summer and winter solstices, were the two greatest and most widespread festivals in Europe. The Church of Rome, in its accommodating spirit, instead of abolishing the custom, yielded to popular feeling, and retained this heathen practice under the garb of a Christian name. See Khautz, *De ritu ignis in natali S. Johannis accensi* (Vienna, 1759); Paciandi, *De cultis S. Joannis Bapt. antiq. Chrt.* (Rom. 1758); Ersch und Gruber, *All. Encyklop.* 2, 22, p. 265; F. Nork, *Fest-Kalender* (Stuttgart, 1847), p. 406. — Chambers, *Cyclop.* a.v.

Johns, Richard

a celebrated member of the Society of "Friends," was born at Bristol, England, in 1645, and, coming to this country in early manhood, settled in Maryland. He was won over to the Quakers by George Fox, and preached

for many years. He died Oct. 16, 1717. For further details, see Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, 3, 190.

Johns, W. G.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Pulaski County, Ky., October 24, 1823, joined the Church at thirteen years of age, was licensed to preach in 1845, and continued in the work for twenty-one years, with interruptions for want of health. Indeed, it is said that so great was his devotion to the Christian ministry that he often preached when barely able to leave his room. He died October 23, 1866. *Conf. Min. Meth. Episc. Church South*, 3, 157.

Johnson, Albert Osborne

an American missionary of the Presbyterian Church to India, was born in Cadiz, Ohio, June 22, 1833. He was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., where he was converted, and, on graduation (1852), went to the Theological Seminary at Alleghany, where he graduated in 1855, and was ordained by the presbytery of Ohio June 12, in the same year. He at once entered the missionary work, which was shared by his wife, whom he had married the day he left the Theological Seminary. But both did not long endure the toils of a missionary life; during the Sepoy rebellion in 1857 they suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Indian rebels. For details, see Walsh, *Memorial of the Futtehgurh Misission and her Martyred Missionaries* (Philada. 1859, 12mo), p. 241 sq. Mr. Johnson is spoken of by Walsh as "a man of very genial influences and of fine social qualities. As a Christian he was zealous and devoted, a man of prayer, and faithful in all his duties; as a missionary he bade fair to excel in every department of labor. His qualifications were of a high order."

Johnson, Enoch,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in North Carolina; he was early converted; joined the itinerancy in 1819, and died November 25, 1824. He was a man of deep piety and useful talents. His labors were abundantly successful, and his character greatly *beloved*. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1, 432.

Johnson, Evan M., D.D.

a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Rhode Island, June 10, 1792. He was ordained to the ministry in Trinity Church, Newport, by bishop Griswold, July 8, 1813; removed to New York City in 1814, and became assistant rector of Grace Church, but the year following he exchanged this position for the rectorate of St. James's Church, Newtown, L.I. In 1824 he settled in Brooklyn, and built St. John's Church. During his ministry he united nearly 4000 couples in marriage, and baptized nearly 10,000 children. He was, at the time of his decease, March 19, 1865, the oldest settled Episcopal clergyman in the State of New York.

Johnson, Haynes

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Newbury, Vermont, in 1801; converted in 1829; entered the New Hampshire Conference in 1831, and died at Newbury, April 9, 1856. He was "a faithful and laborious preacher," and during the ten months previous to his death he made *nine hundred* pastoral visits. He was very successful in winning souls to Christ. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 6, 75.

Johnson, Herman Merrill, S.T.D., LL.D.,

a prominent minister and educator of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Oswego County, N.Y., Nov. 25, 1815. After preparation at Cazenovia Seminar, he entered, in 1837, the junior class of Wesleyan University, graduating with distinction in 1839. The same year he was elected professor of ancient languages in St. Charles's College, Missouri, where he remained for three years. Thence he was called to occupy the chair of ancient languages in Augusta College, Kentucky, which he held for two years, when he was elected professor of ancient languages and literature in the Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware, Ohio. Here he performed for a while the duties of acting president of the institution organizing its curriculum, and was especially interested in introducing therein a Biblical course of study as a method of ministerial education. In 1850 he was elected professor of philosophy and English literature in Dickinson College, a position which he filled for ten years, when he was called to the presidency of this institution, together with the chair of moral science, in 1860. Dr. Johnson died April 5, 1868, just after the memorials in behalf of the Methodist centenary had secured to Dickinson College a fair endowment. He contributed largely to the Church periodicals,

especially the *New York Christian Advocate* and the *Methodist Quarterly Review*. Indeed, he was decidedly able both as a writer and an instructor, and his contributions were always read with uncommon interest; for, as a thinker, he was clear, concise, original, and his writings were often eminently distinguished for their simplicity and grace of expression. He had an especial liking for all questions of historical and philological inquiry, and published a learned edition of the *Clio of Herodotus* (N.Y. 1842, and often). He left unfinished another large and valuable philological contribution, the translation and revision of Eberhard's great Synonymical Dictionary of German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English. It is especially to be regretted that he did not live to complete his *Commentary on the historical Books of the Old Test.* "Personally, Dr. Johnson was a man of many and rare excellencies. He was pre-eminently a scholar, extensively learned, and yet distinguished for culture rather than for mere learning. He was especially eminent as a teacher, and as an administrator and disciplinarian he had few superiors. In private he was a model Christian gentleman, affable, refined, and unassuming; able and entertaining in conversation, and as a companion genial, without descending to any thing out of harmony with his elevated character and position. As a preacher he was both forcible and instructive, though too rigidly correct in his tastes to allow him to become extensively popular. In his relations to the Church he belonged to an important but very small class. His Christian character, his learning, and his confessed abilities fitted him for almost any one of the highest and most responsible offices in the Church. Such was the place he occupied, while others of equal dignity and importance were ready to be offered to him" (*Christian Advocate*, N.Y., April 16, 1868). (J.H.W.)

Johnson, John (1),

an eminent and learned divine of the Church of England, was born Dec. 30, 1662. He was educated at King's School, in the city of Canterbury, and at St. Mary Magdalen College, Cambridge. Soon after graduation (1682) he was nominated by the dean and chapter of Canterbury to a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, and there took the degree of master of arts in 1685. Shortly after he entered into deacon's orders, and became curate to Thomas Hardres, at Hardres, near Canterbury. In 1686 he became vicar of Boughton under the Blean, and in 1687 he held the vicarage of Hermhill, adjoining to Boughton. In 1697 he obtained the living of St. John, in the Isle of Thanet, which he shortly after exchanged for that of Appledon and in 1707 he was inducted to the vicarage of Cranbrook. He died in 1725.

His works display the highest scholarship, a mastery both, of the Greek and Hebrew languages, and a deep research into the Holy Scriptures. His *Unbloody Sacrifice* (London, 1714, 8vo; latest ed. Oxf. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo) is the most complete work on the Eucharist, considered as a sacrifice, extant, particularly on account of its large collection of authorities from the fathers. which are printed in full. These are cited to prove that the Eucharist is a proper material sacrifice; that it is both eucharistic and propitiatory; that it is to be offered by proper officers; that the oblation is to be made on a proper altar; that it is to be consumed by manducation; together with arguments to prove that what our Savior speaks concerning eating his flesh and drinking his blood in the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel is principally meant of the Eucharist. This publication, having involved him in a bitter controversy on account of its High Church views, induced him to publish, in 1717, *The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar unveiled and supported*, part 2, showing the agreement and disagreement of the Eucharist with the sacrifices of the ancients, and the excellency of the former; the great importance of the Eucharist both as a feast and a sacrifice; the necessity of frequent communion; the unity of the Eucharist; the nature of excommunication; the primitive method of preparation, with devotions for the altar. His other works are, *A Collection of all Ecclesiastical Laws, etc., concerning the Government, etc., of the Church of England* (Lond. 1720, 2 vols. 8vo; Oxford, 1850-51, 2 vols. 8vo): — *A Collection of Discourses*, etc. (Lond. 1728 2 vols. 8vo): — *The Psalter, or Holy David and his old English Translators cleared* (London, 1707, 8vo). See *Life*, by Rev. Thos. Brett Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone. *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* 2, s.v. (E.deP.)

Johnson, John (2),

an able and popular minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, born in Louisa Co., Va., Jan. 7, 1783; joined the Church in 1807, and entered the Conference at Liberty Hill, Tennessee in 1808. Two years after he removed to Kentucky, and was appointed first to the Sandy River Circuit, and in 1811 to Natchez Circuit. His early educational advantages had been few, and when he entered the ministry of his Church he can hardly be said to have possessed a fair English education; but unremitting efforts to gain knowledge at last made him one of the best scholars of his Conference. Thus, while at the Natchez Circuit, he displayed an extensive knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew, of which no one had believed him to have an idea even, and from that time he began to rise rapidly in the estimation of his

colleagues. He now took rank with Lakin, Sale, Page, Blackman, and Oglesby, and was regarded by many as the most remarkable preacher of the West. In 1812 he was appointed to the Nashville Circuit; then successively to the Livingston, Christian, and Goose Creek, and finally again to the Livingston Circuit; and in 1818 he was sent to the Nashville Station. While here he engaged in a controversy on the question of immersion with the Baptist preacher Vardeman, in which he is generally believed to have come off victor; at least from this event dates his great popularity in the West. "Henceforth," says Redford (*Methodism in Kentucky*, 2, 143), "the name of John Johnson was the synonym of success in religious controversies." From 1820 he filled successively the Red River, Hopkinsville, and Russellville Circuits, and in 1823 he was stationed at Louisville, and in 1824 at Maysville, and, after several years of rest, was in 1831 appointed presiding elder of the Green River, and in 1832 of Hopkinsville District. In 1835 he was finally located, and he now removed to Mt. Vernon, Illinois. Here he died April 9, 1858. "As a Christian," says the *Western Christian Advocate* (May 26, 1858), "brother Johnson was consistent, exemplary, and deeply devoted. 'Holiness to the Lord' appears to have been his motto. He died in great peace, testifying, as his flesh and heart failed, that God was the strength of his heart and his portion forever." (J.H.W.)

Johnson, John (3).

SEE JOHNSONIANS.

Johnson, John Barent,

a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in 1769 in Brooklyn, L.I.; graduated at Columbia College, 1792; studied theology under Dr. John H. Livingston, and entered the ministry in 1795. He was copastor of the Reformed Dutch Church, Albany, with Rev. Dr. John Bassett, from 1796 to 1802, and afterwards pastor of the church in Brooklyn, 1802-3. Of prepossessing appearance and engaging manners, he won many friends by his dignified and courteous bearing. He was popular with all classes, especially with the young. As a preacher he was distinguished for a melodious voice, a natural manner, and effective oratory. His eulogy on General Washington produced a great sensation throughout the community. The exordium was spoken of at the time as a rare specimen of eloquence; and the whole performance was certainly of a very high order." It was published by the Legislature, at whose request it was delivered. He

also published several other discourses, and contributed largely to literary periodicals of his day. In person he was tall, slender, well proportioned, and graceful. His imagination was brilliant and his fervor profound. His intellectual qualities and theological and literary attainments were eminent. He wrote his sermons, but delivered them extemporaneously, with great simplicity, directness, and unction. He died of consumption, Aug. 29, 1803. Of his three children, two became Episcopalian clergymen: one at Jamaica, L.I.; the other a professor in the General Theological Seminary at New York. — Rogers, *Historical Discourse* (Albany, 1858); Sprague, *Annals*, 9, 167. (W.J.R.T.).

Johnson, Joseph

an Indian preacher, was born at Mohegan, near Norwich, Conn., about 1750. After a brief course of instruction under Mr. Wheelock at Lebanon, he was sent, at the age of fifteen, as a schoolmaster to the Six Nations of Indians in New York, and remained there a couple of years. Afterwards he spent a vagrant life for some time, until, during a fit of sickness occasioned by his irregularities, he became a sincere penitent, and determined to preach the Gospel of Christ. He was soon licensed to preach, and for several years was a missionary in the State of New York. He was well acquainted with theology. The date of his death is not known to us.

Johnson, Samuel (1)

an English divine, and a learned but violent writer against popery in the reign of James II, was born in Warwickshire in 1649. He studied at St. Paul's School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1670 he obtained the living of Corrilgham, Essex, but continued to reside in London, and mingled much in politics. He was a friend of Essex, and chaplain to lord William Russell, and advocated the succession of the duke of York. He was a decided opponent of king James II and of his schemes to introduce popery as the religion of the state, and attacked Dr. Hickes (q.v.), the upholder of passive obedience, in a pamphlet entitled *Julian the Apostate*. He would have gone further had not the death of his protector, lord Russell, obliged him to become more prudent, and to keep his *Julian's Arts to undermine Christianity* unpublished. For having written the former work he was summoned before judge Jeffries, and of course condemned to a heavy fine. Unable to pay the fine, he was imprisoned, and during his confinement wrote *An humble and hearty Address to all Protestants in the*

present Army, intended to provoke a rebellion against king James II. He was now put in the pillory in Palace Yard, at Charing Cross, whipped, and fined, after being degraded from orders. After the Revolution of 1688, William III caused the verdict to be reversed, and gave him an indemnity. He died in 1703. His writings were collected and published under the style *Works* (2d ed. Lond. 1713, fol.). See *Biographia Britannica*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 26, 791; Debary, *Hist. Ch. of Engl. from James II to 1717*, p. 70; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, 2, 971. (E de P.)

Johnson, Samuel (2), D.D.,

an American divine, was born at Guilford, Conn., Oct. 14, 1696, and passed A.B. in 1714 at Yale College, then situated at Saybrook. On the removal of Yale to New Haven he became one of its tutors, and in 1720 pastor of the Congregational Church, West Haven. Determined to change his ecclesiastical relations, he went to England, and received episcopal ordination in 1723. He then visited Oxford and Cambridge, where he was made A.M., and returned to America. Upon his arrival he entered on the mission of Stratford, Conn., and formed the acquaintance of William Burnet, son of the bishop of Salisbury. His ministerial duties were now considerably increased, and his pen warmly engaged for some years in defense of episcopacy. In 1743 he was made D.D. by the University of Oxford. In 1744 he was appointed president of King's College, New York, in which office he continued till 1754, when he returned to Stratford, where he spent a tranquil and dignified old age, chiefly in literary labor. In 1746 he issued *A System of Morality*, and in 1752 *A Compendium of Logic, Metaphysics, and Ethics*, and other theological and miscellaneous treatises after this date. He died Jan. 6, 1772. — Sprague, *Annals*, 5, 52; Allibone, *Dict. Eng. and Am. Auth.* 2, 971. (E.deP.)

Johnson, Samuel (3), LL.D.,

one of the most distinguished literary men of the eighteenth century, was born at Lichfield September 18, 1709. His early education was acquired in his native town. In 1728 he was entered at Pembroke College, Oxford, but, in consequence of the want of means, did not remain long enough to obtain his degree. In 1731 his father died insolvent. In the same year he went to Bosworth as usher of a school. He soon became disgusted with the drudgery of teaching, and preferred to support himself by working for booksellers in Birmingham. In 1736 he married Mrs. Porter, the widow of

a mercer, who brought him £800. Failing in an effort to establish an academy, he repaired in 1737 to London, accompanied by his celebrated pupil David Garrick. He now devoted himself entirely to literary labor. His first production which attracted notice was his *London*, a poem in imitation of the third satire of Juvenal. Having entered into an engagement, with the *Gentleman's Magazine*, he published the parliamentary debates, which, being then a breach of privilege, came out under the fiction of Debates in the Senate of Lilliput. These obtained great celebrity on account of their extraordinary eloquence, and were almost exclusively the product of his own invention. The works which were now produced were celebrated beyond measure, and will ever be regarded as extraordinary monuments both of vigor and originality in thinking, and of great though ponderous power of expression.

But Dr. Johnson had excellencies far superior to mere literary accomplishments. He was truly a devout man, and he possessed a vigor and independence of mind which enabled him to scorn the ridicule and silence the opposition of wits and worldlings to serious religion. He often recurred in after life to the impression made upon his tender imagination by his mother's example and instruction. While a student at Oxford these impressions were revived and intensified, according to his own account, by the careful study of Law's *Serious Call*, in consequence of which he was incited to a devout and holy life. Serious and pious meditations and resolutions had been early familiar to his mind. The pious gratitude with which he acknowledged mercies upon every occasion, the humble submission which he breathes when it is the will of his heavenly Father to try him with affliction, show how seriously the mind of Johnson had been impressed with a sense of religion.

Dr. Johnson is generally charged with extreme bigotry, and want of charity towards religionists who differed from him. This charge, however, is very unfair in the face of his repeated declaration to the contrary. "All denominations of Christians," he is reported to have said, "have really little difference in point of doctrine, though they may differ widely in external forms." "For my part, I think all Christians, whether papist or Protestant, agree in the essential articles, and that their differences are trivial, and rather political than religious." He spoke in the highest terms of Wesley from intimate knowledge of his character, having been at the same college with him, and said that "he thought of religion only." "Whatever might be thought of some Methodist teachers," he said, "he could scarcely doubt the

sincerity of that man, who travelled 900 miles in a month, and preached twelve times in a week; for no adequate reward, merely temporal, could be given for such indefatigable labor. The established clergy in general did not preach plain enough; polished period and glittering sentences flew over the heads of the common people without impression on their hearts. Something might be necessary to excite the affections of the common people, who were sunk in languor and lethargy, and therefore he supposed that the new concomitant of Methodism might probably produce so desirable an effect. The mind, like the body, delighted in change and novelty, and even in religion itself courted new appearances and modifications.” His views on the great subjects of original sin, in consequence of the fall of man, and of the atonement made by our Savior, as reported by his celebrated biographer, were decided and evangelical. His sentiments on natural and revealed religion were equally explicit. In short, it appears that few men have ever lived in whose thoughts religion had a larger or more practical share. “His habitual piety,” says lord Brougham, “his sense of his own imperfections, his generally blameless conduct in the various relations of life, have already been sufficiently described. He was a good man, as he was a great man; and he had so firm a regard for virtue that he wisely set much greater store by his worth than by his fame.” “Though consciousness of superiority might sometimes induce him to carry it high with man (and even this was much abated in the latter part of his life), his devotions have shown to the whole world how humbly he walked at all times with his God.” “If then, it be asked,” says lord Mahon, “who first in England, at that period, breasted the waves and stemmed the tide of infidelity — who enlisted wit and eloquence, together with argument and learning, on the side of revealed religion, first turned the literary current in its favor, mainly prepared the reaction which succeeded that praise seems most justly to belong to Dr. Samuel Johnson. Religion was with him no mere lip service nor cold formality; he was mindful of it in his social hours as much as in his graver lucubrations; and he brought to it not merely erudition such as few indeed possessed, but the weight of the highest character, and the respect which even his enemies could not deny him. It may be said of him that, though not in orders, he did the Church of England better service than most of those who at that listless sera ate her bread.”

The death of this great man was a beautiful commentary on his life. “When at length,” says lord Macaulay, “the moment dreaded through so many years came close, the dark cloud passed away from Johnson’s mind. His

temper became unusually patient and gentle; he ceased to think of death and of that which lies beyond death, and he spoke much of the mercy of God and the propitiation of Christ. Though the tender care which had mitigated his sufferings during months of sickness at Streatham was withdrawn he was not left desolate. In this serene frame of mind he died Dec. 13, 1784; a week later he was laid in Westminster Abbey, among the eminent men of whom he had been the historian — Cowley and Denham, Dryden and Congreve, Gay, Prior, and Addison.” (E.deP.)

It remains for us to append a brief outline of all the literary labors of his life. In addition to his contributions to the *Gentleman's Magazine* and his poem *London*, Johnson wrote in 1744 an interesting *Life of Richard Savage*; in 1749 his best poem, *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, an imitation of the tenth satire of Juvenal; and in 1750 commenced *The Rambler*, a periodical which he conducted for two years, and the contents of which were almost wholly his own composition. But perhaps one of his greatest accomplishments is his *Dictionary*, a noble piece of work, entitling its author to be considered the founder of English lexicography; it appeared in 1755, after eight years of solid labor. *The Idler*, another periodical, was begun by him in 1758, and carried on for two years also; and in 1759 occurred one of the most touching episodes of his life the writing of *Rasselas* to pay the expenses of his mother's funeral. It was written, he tells us, “in the evenings of a week.” But, with all these publications before the public, he did not really emerge from obscurity until 1762, when a pension of £300 a year was conferred on him by lord Bute; and in the following year occurred an event, apparently of little moment, but which had a lasting influence upon his fame this was his introduction to James Boswell, whose *Life of Dr. Johnson* is probably more imperishable than any of the doctor's own writings. In 1764 the famous Literary Club was instituted, and in the following year began his intimacy with the Thrales. In the same year appeared his edition of Shakspeare. In 1773 he visited the Highlands with Boswell, and in 1781 appeared his *Lives of the Poets*, his last literary work of any importance. See Boswell, *Life of Johnson*; Wilkes, *Christian Essays*; Murphy, *Life*, in preface to *Works*; *Memoir* by Walter Scott; *Essays* by Macaulay and Carlyle; a brief but elaborate character of Dr. Johnson, written by Sir James Mackintosh, in his *Life*, 2, 166-9; *Dr. Johnson, his Religious Life and Death* (N.Y. 1,850, 8vo); Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; and the excellent and elaborate article in Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Johnson, Thomas

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Virginia, July 11, 1802; went to Missouri in 1822, and commenced the work of the ministry in 1825. He labored as an itinerant in the bounds of the St. Louis Conference, filling some of the most important stations; but spent his greatest labors, and was most successful, as missionary to the Indians. His name will ever be connected with the history of Indian missions. Wise and earnest, he carried success with him in his responsible and arduous labors. He honorably sustained his character as a Christian minister through all his pilgrimage, and died an approved servant of God. He was shot by unknown parties in the night of Jan. 3, 1865, probably on account of his political principles. Among his colleagues in the Conference Johnson ranked with the first, and was highly esteemed by all. Says one of them: "He was *a man of principle*; one of the very few among the many thousands who, on all occasions and under all circumstances, acted upon the settled principle of morality and religion." See *Conf. Min. M. E. Ch. S.* 3, 168.

Johnson, William Bullien, D.D.,

a Baptist minister, was born on John's Island, near Charleston; S.C., June 13, 1782. He was intended for the jurist's profession, but after conversion (1804) he decided for the ministry, and was ordained, January, 1806, pastor of a church at Eutaw. S.C. In 1809 he removed to Columbia; later he lived at Savannah, Ga., whence he returned to Columbia in 1816. In 1822 he was placed in charge of the female academy at Greenville, S.C. Eight or nine years later he removed to Edgeville, S.C., as pastor, teaching also at the same time at a female high I school, and subsequently to Anderson, S.C., where a university for ladies bears his name. He finally returned to Greenville, S.C., where he labored faithfully for the Church of his choice up to the hour of his death, in perfect vigor of mind and soundness of body very unlike an octogenarian. He died there in 1862. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Brown University in 1833. Dr. Johnson was a prominent member of the Bible Revision Society, and one of the presidents of the General Baptist Convention of the United States (formed in 1814). Over the Baptist Convention of his native state he presided for a score and a half of years. He wrote largely for the religious periodicals of his Church, and published *Development of the Gospel of Jesus Christ through the Government and Order of the Churches*, besides sermons, circulars, and addresses. — Appleton, *Cyclop.* 10, 36.

Johnsonians

followers of John Johnson, a Baptist minister at Liverpool, England, in the last century, of whom there are still several congregations in different parts of England. He denied that faith was a duty, or, even action of the soul, and defined it “an active principle” conferred by grace; and denied also the duty of ministers to exhort the unconverted, or preach any *moral duties* whatever. Though Mr. Johnson entertained high supralapsarian notions on the divine decrees, he admitted the universality of the death of Christ. On the doctrine of the Trinity, his followers are said to have embraced the indwelling scheme, with Calvinistic views of justification and the atonement. See Johnson’s *Faith of God’s Elect*; Brine’s *Mistakes of Mr. Johnson* (1745).

Johnston, Arthur

a Scottish writer of great celebrity, a native of Caskieben, near Aberdeen, was born in 1587. He was a physician by profession, but spent most of his time in literary pursuits; especially thorough was his acquaintance with Latin, and it is mainly for his Latin version of the Psalms, one of his last and best works, that we mention his name here. They were published under the title of *Psalmorum Davidis Paraphrasis Poetica, et Canticorum Evangelicorum* (Anerd. 1637, 12mo, and often since). As another writer of note, George Buchanan, also furnished a Latin version of the Psalms, a comparison was frequently instituted as to the comparative merits of their work. Hallam (*Liter. Hist. of Europe*, 4th ed. Lond. 1854, 3, 53), in alluding to it, thinks that “Johnston’s Psalms, all of which are in elegiac meter, do not fall far short of those of Buchanan either in elegance of style or correctness of Latinity. Johnston spent the earlier part of his life in France and Italy. His medical degree he obtained at Padua. He returned to Scotland in 1625, and about 1628 was appointed physician to the court of Charles I. In 1637 his literary attainments received recognition by his election to the rectorate of King’s College. He died in 1641. Besides the Psalms, he translated into Latin the Te Deum, Creed, Decalogue, etc.; also *Solomon’s Song* (Lond. 1633, 8vo). His other publications are *Elegiacum Obitum R. Jacobi* (Lond. 1625, 4to) : — *Epigrammata* (Aberdeen, 1632, 8vo). See memoirs of him in Benson’s ed. of Johnston’s version of the Psalms; Allibone, *Dict. of Eng. and Amer. Authors*, 2, 983; *Cyclop. Brit.* vol. 12, s.v.

Johnston, John

a Scotch minister, was a native of Aberdeen, and flourished in the latter half of the 16th century. He was, like his relative Arthur Johnston (q.v.), of a poetical turn of mind, but he also served his Church (the Presbyterian) in the capacity of professor of divinity at St. Andrew's College. He died in 1612. He wrote *Consolatio Christiana sub Cruce*, etc. (1609, 8vo): — *Jambi Sacra* (1611): — *Tertrustich r et Lemmatae Sacra — Item Cantica Sacra — Item Icones Regum Judeoe et Israelis* (Lugd. Bat. 1612, 4to); etc. See Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Johnstone, Bryce

an eminent Scottish theologian and writer, was born at Annan, Dumfriesshire, in 1747. He studied at the University of Edinburgh, where he graduated D.D. He entered the Church, and was for a long time pastor of Holyrood (from 1771), and died in 1805. He wrote, *Commentary on the Revelation of John* (1794, 2 vols. 8vo) : — *On the Influence of Religion on civil Society and civil Government* (1801). All of his *Sermons* and *Life* were published by his nephew, the Rev. John Johnstone (1807, 8ro); etc. See Gorton's *Biogr. Dictionary*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* s.v.

Joi'ada

(Heb. *Yoyadats'*, [*dywy*, a contraction of JEHOIADA, found only in Nehemiah, who invariably uses it), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. *Ἰωειδά* v.r. *Ἰωιδά*, Vulg. *Jojada*, A. Vers. "Jehoiada.") Son of Paseah, and apparently one of the chief priests; in conjunction with Meshullam he repaired the Old Gate, *SEE JERUSALEM*, with its appurtenances, after the captivity (^{<1616>}Nehemiah 3:6). B.C. 446.
2. (Sept. *Ἰωαδά* v.r. *Ἰωιαδά*, *Ἰωδάέ*.) Son and successor of Eliashib in the high priesthood, himself succeeded by his son Jonathan (^{<1620>}Nehemiah 12:10, 11, 22); another of his sons having married a daughter of Sanballat, on which account he was banished (^{<1638>}Nehemiah 13:28). B.C. post 446. Josephus (*Ant.* 11, 7, 1) Graecizes the name as *Judas* (*Ἰούδας*). *SEE HIGH PRIEST*.

Joi'akim

(Heb. *Yoyakimn'*, ~~μυακίμ~~, a contraction of JEHOIAKIM, used exclusively by Nehemiah; Sept. ~~Ἰωακείμ~~ v.r. ~~Ἰωακίμ~~), son of Jeshua and father of Eliashib, high priests successively (^{<1620>}Nehemiah 12:10, 12, 26). B.C. ante 446. Josephus does not mention him. *SEE HIGH PRIEST.*

Joi'arib

(Heb. *Yoyarib'*, ~~byραρίβ~~, a contraction of JEHOIARIB, occurring exclusively in Ezra and Nehemiah), the name of three or four persons.

1. (Sept. ~~Ἰωαρίβ~~ v.r. ~~Ἰωρίβ~~.) A priest named (^{<1610>}Nehemiah 11:10) in connection with Jachin, and as father of Jedaiah (q.v.), but by some error; compare ^{<1390>}1 Chronicles 9:10, where he is called JEHOIARIB *SEE JEHOIARIB* (q.v.), well known as founder of one of the sacerdotal “courses.” *SEE PRIEST.*

2. (Sept. ~~Ἰωαρίβ~~.) A descendant of Judah, son of Zechariah and father of Adaiah (^{<1615>}Nehemiah 11:5), apparently through Shelah. See SHILONI. B.C. considerably ante 536.

3. (Sept. ~~Ἰωαρείβ~~, ~~Ἰωαρίβ~~.) One of the priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (^{<1616>}Nehemiah 12:6). He was the father of Mattenai, a contemporary with the high priest Joiakim (^{<1629>}Nehemiah 12:19). B.C. 536.

4. (Sept. ~~Ἰωαρείμ~~ v.r. ~~Ἰωαρίμ~~.) A person mentioned in connection with Elnathan as a “man of understanding” (the others being called “chief men”), apparently among the priests, sent for by Ezra at the river of Ahava to devise means for obtaining a company of Levites to return with him to Jerusalem (^{<1386>}Ezra 8:16). B.C. 459.

Joining

besides its common sense (~~qbd~~; to *cling* or adhere), is technically used of the *binders* (~~t/rBj m]~~ *mechabberoth'*), whether of wood or stone, of the walls of a building (^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 22:3). *SEE COUPLING.*

Joint

besides its usual meaning (q̄bD, *de'bek*, ἀφή, etc.), is, in one passage (^{<2701>}Song of Solomon 7:1), very erroneously employed in the A.V. as a rendering of μϣϫΜϣ *i chammukim'* (Sept. vaguely ῥνθμοί, *Vulg. juncturoe*, occurs nowhere else), the *wrappers* (of the thighs), i.e. *drawers*, a part of the female dress; which, in the case of bridal toilette, are represented as being fringed with a worked edging like lace or a skillfully chased jewel. *SEE ATTIRE.*

Jok'deim

(Heb. *Yokdedm'*, μ[ϫϣ]; *burning of the people*; Sept. Ιεκδαάμ, *Vulg. Jucadam*), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Jezreel and Zanoah (^{<1656>}Joshua 15:56). The associated names indicate a locality in the district southeast of Hebron, perhaps at the ruined site marked as *ed-Dar* on Van de Velde's *Map*, just north of Jebel Ziph.

Jo'kim

(Heb. *Yokim'*, μϣϫε, prob. a contraction of JOIAKIM; Sept. Ἰωακείμ v.r. Ἰωακίμ, *Vulg. paraphrases qui stare fecit solem*), a person mentioned among the descendants of Shelah (his third son, according to Burrington), son of Judah (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 4:22). B.C. prob. ante 588. *SEE JASHUBI-LEHEM.* "The Targum translates, 'and the prophets and scribes who came forth from the seed of Joshua.' The reading which that and the *Vulg.* had evidently was μϣϫε applied by some Rabbinical tradition to Joshua, and at the same time identifying Joash and Saraph, mentioned in the same verse, with Mahlon and Chilion. Jerome quotes a Hebrew legend that Jokim was Elimelech, the husband of Naomi, in whose days the sun stood still on account of the transgressors of the law (*Quoest. Heb. in Paral.*)"

Jok'meam

(Heb. *Yokmeaim'*, μ[ϫϣ]; *gathering of the people*; in ^{<11042>}1 Kings 4:12, Sept. Ἰεγμάαμ v.r. Λουκάμ, *Vulg. Jecmaan*, Auth. Vers. "Jokneam;" in ^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 6:68 [53], Ἰεκμαάν, *Jecmaam*), a place elsewhere called KIBZAIM (^{<1622>}Joshua 21:22), but better known as JOKNEAM (^{<1622>}Joshua 12:22, etc.).

Jok'neam

(Heb. *Yokneam'*, יְנוֹעַם, *possession of the people*; Sept. Ἰεκονάμ, Vulg. *Jachanan. Jeconam, Jecnam*), a royal city of the Canaanites (^{<622>}Joshua 12:22), situated on the southwestern boundary of Zebulun (but not within it, *SEE TRIBE*), near Dabbasheth, and fronted by a stream [the Kishon] (^{<691>}Joshua 19:11); assigned out of the territory of Zebulun to the Levites of the family of Merari (^{<623>}Joshua 21:34). From ^{<176>}1 Chronicles 6:68, the name appears to have been in later times written in the nearly synonymous form of JOKMEAM, and it thus appears. (in the original) as the boundary point of one of the purveyorships of Solomon (^{<1042>}1 Kings 4:12). It also seems to have been identical with the Levitical city KIBZAIM (see Lightfoot, *Opp.* 2, 233) in Mount Ephraim (^{<622>}Joshua 21:22). Dr. Robinson has lately identified it with the modern Tell *Kaimon*, a commanding position at the foot of Mount Carmel, across the Kishon from the plain of Esdraelon, and in a locality exactly agreeing with the scriptural data, and in name and situation with the CYAMON *SEE CYAMON* (q.v.) of the Apocrypha (Judith 7:3), as well as with that of the *Cnammona* of Eusebius and the *Cimana* of Jerome, although (in their *Onomasticon*) they profess ignorance of the site of Jokneam (new ed. of *Bibl. Researches*, 3, 115). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 91) gives a conjecture agreeing with the latter part of this identification. (See also Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 326; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 119.)

Jok'shan

(Heb. *Yokshan'*, יְכָשָׁן; *narer*; Sept. Ἰεζάν v.r. Ἰεζάν or Ἰεκσάν), the second son of Abraham and Keturah, whose sons Sheba and Dedan appear to have been the ancestors of the Sabaeans and Dedanites, that peopled a part of Arabia Felix (^{<282>}Genesis 25:2, 3; ^{<313>}1 Chronicles 1:32, 33). B.C. cir. 2020. "If the Keturahites stretched across the desert from the head of the Arabian to that of the Persian Gulf, *SEE DEDAN*, then we must suppose that Jokshan returned westwards to the trans-Jordanic country, where are placed the settlements of his sons, or at least the chief of their settlements, for a wide spread of these tribes seems to be indicated in the passages in the Bible which make mention of them. The writings of the Arabs are rarely of use in the case of Keturahite tribes, whom they seem to confound with Ishmaelites in one common appellation. They mention a dialect of Jokshan (Yakish, who is Yokshan, as having been formerly spoken near 'Aden and El-Jened, in Southern Arabia: Yakit's *Moajam*,

cited in the *Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, 8, 600-1; 10, 30-1); but that Midianites penetrated so far into the peninsula we hold to be highly improbable" (Smith). "Knobel (*Genes.* p. 188) suggests that the name *Jokshan* may have passed into *Kashan* (װק), and that his descendants were the *Cassanitoe* (κασσανίται) of Ptolemy (6, 7, 6) arid Steph. Byzant. (s.v.), the *Casandres* (Κασανδρείς) of Agatharchides (p. 6, ed. Huds.), the *Gasandres* (Γασανδρείς) of Diod. Sic. (3, 44), and the *Casani* or *Gasani* of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 6, 32), who dwelt by the Red Sea, to the south of the Cinaedocolpites, and extended to the most northern of the Joktanites." **SEE ARABIA.**

Jok'tan

(Heb. *Yoktan'*, יֶפְתָּח; *little*; Sept. Ἰεκτάν, Josephus Ἰούκτας, *Ant.* 1, 6, 4; Vulg. Jectan), a Shemite, second named of the two sons of Eber; his brother being Peleg (^{<0105>}Genesis 10:25; ^{<1019>}1 Chronicles 1:19). B.C. cir. 2400. He is mentioned as the progenitor of thirteen sons or heady of tribes, supposed to have resided in Southern Arabia (^{<0105>}Genesis 10:26-30); ^{<1019>}1 Chronicles 1:20-23). The Arabians called him *Kahtan*, and assert that from him the *eight* original residents of Yemen sprang. His name is still pointed out by them near Keshin (Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 287), and traces of the same name appear in a city mentioned by Niebuhr (*Beschr.* p. 275) as lying three days' journey north of Nejeran, perhaps the station *Jaktan* alluded to by Edrisi as situated in the district of Sanaa. (See A. Schultens, *Hist. imp. vetust. Joctanidar. in Ar. Fel. ex Abulfeda, etc.*, Harderov. 1786; Pococke, *Specim. hist. Arab.* p. 32 sq.; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 3, 2, 553 sq.; Bochart's *Phaleg*, 3, 15.)

The original limits of the Joktanidae are stated in the Bible: "Their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the East" (^{<0105>}Genesis 10:30). The position of Mesha, which is reasonably supposed to be the western boundary, is still uncertain, **SEE MESHA**; but Sephar is well established as being the same as Zafari, the seaport town on the east of the modern Yemen, and formerly one of the chief centers of the great Indian and African trade. **SEE SEPHAR.**

1. The native traditions respecting *Joktan himself* commence with a difficulty. The ancestor of the great southern peoples was called *Kahtan*, who, say the Arabs, was, the same as Joktan. To this some European critics have objected that there is no good reason to account for the

.change of name, and that the identification of Kahtan with Joktan is evidently a Jewish tradition adopted by Mohammed or his followers, and consequently at or after the promulgation of El-Islam. M. Caussin de Perceval commences his essay on the history of Yemen (*Essai*, 1, 39) with this assertion, and adds, "Le nom de Cahtan, disent-ils [les Arabes], est le nom de Yectan, legerement altere en passant d'une langue etrangere dans la langue Arabe." In reply to these objectors, we may state:

- (1.) The Rabbins hold a tradition that Joktan settled in India (see Joseph. *Ant.* 1, 6, 4), and the supposition of a Jewish influence in the Arab traditions respecting him is therefore untenable. In the present case, even were this not so, there is an absence of motive for Mohammed's adopting traditions which alienate from the race of Ishmael many tribes of Arabia: the influence here suspected may rather be found in the contradictory assertion, put forward by a few of the Arabs, and rejected by the great majority and the most judicious of their historians, that Kahtan was descended from Ishmael.
- (2.) That the traditions in question are post-Mohammedan cannot be proved; the same may be said of everything which Arab writers tell us dates before the prophet's time; for then oral tradition alone existed, if we except the rock cut inscriptions of the Himyarites, which are too few, and our knowledge of them is too slight to admit of much weight attaching to them.
- (3.) In the *Mir-at ez-Zeman* it is stated, "Ibn El-Kelbi says, Yuktan [the Arabic equivalent of Joktan] is the same as Kahtan, son of 'Abir," i.e. Eber, and so say the generality of the Arabs. El-Beladhiri says, "People differ respecting Kahtan; some say he is the same as Yuktan, who is mentioned in the Pentateuch; but the Arabs arabicized his name and said Kahtan, the son of Had [because they identified their prophet Hud with Eber, whom they call 'Abir]; and some say, son of Es-Semeyfa," or, as is said in one place by the author here quoted, "El-Hemeysa, the son of Nebt [or Nabit, i.e. Nebaioth], the son of Ismail," i.e. Ishmael. He then proceeds, in continuation of the former passage, "Abi-Hanifeh ed-Dinawari says, He is Kahtan, the son of Abir, and was named Kahtan only because of his suffering from drought" [which is termed in Arabic Kaht]. (*Mir-at ez-Zeman*; account of the sons of Shem.) Of similar changes of names by the Arabs there are numerous instances. (See the remarks occurring in the

Koran, chap. 2, 248, in *the Expositions* of Ez-Zamakhsheri and El-Beydawi.)

(4.) If the traditions of Kahtan be rejected (and in this rejection we cannot agree), they are, it must be remembered, immaterial to the fact that the peoples called by the Arabs descendants of Kahtan are certainly Joktanites. His sons' colonization of Southern Arabia is proved by indisputable and undisputed identifications, and the great kingdom which there existed for many ages before our era, and in its later days was renowned in the world of classical antiquity, was as surely Joktanitic.

2. The settlements of the *sons of Joktan* are examined in the separate articles bearing their names, and generally in ARABIA. They colonized the whole of the south of the peninsula, the old "Arabia Felix," or the Yemen (for this appellation had a very wide significance in early times), stretching, according to the Arabs (and there is in this case no ground for doubting their general correctness), to Mekkeh on the northwest, and along nearly the whole of the southern coast eastwards, and far inland. At Mekkeh tradition connects the two great races of Joktan and Ishmael by the marriage of a daughter of Jurhum the Joktanite with Ishmael. It is necessary, in mentioning this Jurhum, who is called a "son" of Joktan (Kahtan), to observe that "son" in these cases must be regarded as signifying "descendant," and that many generations (though how many, or in what order, is not known) are missing from the existing list between Kahtan (embracing the most important time of the Joktanites) and the establishment of the comparatively modern Himyaritic kingdom, from this latter date, stated by Caussin, *Essai*, 1, 63, at B.C. cir. 100, the succession of the Tubbaas is apparently preserved to us. At Mekkeh the tribe of Jurhum long held the office of guardians of the Kaabeh, or temple, and the sacred inclosure, until they were expelled by the Ishmaelites (Kutb ed-Din, *Hist. of Mekkeh*, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 35 and 39 sq.; and Caussin, *Essai*, 1, 194).

But it was at Seba, the Biblical Sheba, that the kingdom of Joktan attained its greatness. In the southwestern angle of the peninsula, Sana (Uzal), Seba (Sheba), and Hadramaut (Hazarmaveth), all closely neighboring, formed together the principal known settlements of the Joktanites. Here arose the kingdom of Sheba, followed in later times by that of Himyar. The dominant tribe from remote ages seems to have been that of Seba (or Sheba, the *Saboei* of the Greeks), while the family of Himyar (*Homeritoe*) held the

first place in the tribe. The kingdom called that of Himyar we believe to have been merely a late phasis of the old Sheba, dating; both in its rise and its name, only shortly before our era.

Next in importance to the tribe of Seba was that of Hadramaut, which, till the fall of the Himyaritic power, maintained a position of independence and a direct line of rulers from Kahtan (Caussin, 1, 135-6). Joktanic tribes also passed northwards to Hireh, in El-Irak, and to Ghassan, near Damascus. The emigration of these and other tribes took place on the occasion of the rupture of a great dike (the dike of El-Arim), above the metropolis of Seba; a catastrophe that appears, from the concurrent testimony of Arabic writers, to have devastated a great extent of country, and destroyed the city Ma-rib or Seba. This event forms the commencement of an era, the dates of which exist in the inscriptions on the dike and elsewhere; but when we should place that commencement is still quite an open question. (See the extracts from El-Mesudi and other authorities, edited by Schultens; Caussin, 1, 84 sq.) See Tuch, *Commentary on Genesis* (Halle, 1838). chap. 10; Knobel, *Völkertafel*, p. 178 sq.; Ritter, *Halbinsel Arabien*, 1, 38 sq.; Dr. Ley, *De Templi Meccani origine* (Berlin, 1849).

Jok'theel

(Hebrew *Yooktheel*, **22l aḗḥj**; *subdued by God*), the name of two cities.

1. (Sept. **Ἰεχθαήλ** v.r. **Ἰαχαρεήλ**.) A town in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Mizpeh and Lachish (^{<0653>}Joshua 15:38). The associated names indicate a locality in the district southwest or west of Eleutheropolis (Keil's *Commentary*, ad loc.); possibly at *Balin*, a small modern village a little south of Tell es-Safieh (Robinson, *Researches*, 2, 368).

2. (Sept. **Ἰεκθοήλ** v.r. **Ἰεθοήλ**.) The name given by king Amaziah to SELAH, the capital of Idumaea, or Arabia Petrea, and subsequently borne by it (^{<1247>}2 Kings 14:7); from which circumstance he appears to have improved it after having captured it. *SEE PETRA*.

Jolly, Alexander

an English prelate, was born in 1756. He was ordained for the ministry in 1777, and became pastor at Turiff the same year. In 1778 he removed to Frasersburgh, where he resided for forty-nine years. In 1796 he was elevated to the bishopric of Dundee, and later he became bishop of Moray,

a see founded in the 12th century, and which, after, bishop Jolly's decease, was absorbed in other diocesei. He died in 1838. Bishop Jolly's works are, *Baptismal: Regeneration* (Lond. 1826; new edition, with Life of author by Cheyne, 1840, 12mo): — *Sunday Services and Holy Days*, etc. (1828; 3d ed., with Memoir of author by Bp. Walker, Edinb. 1840, 12mo): — *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist* (1832, 12mo; 2d ed. Aberdeen, 1847, 12mo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and American Authors*, 2, 986.

Jomtob.

SEE LIPPMANN.

Jon, Francis Du

SEE JUNIUS.

Jo'na

(^{<404>}John 1:42). *SEE JONAS.*

Jon'adab

a shortened form of the name *Jehonadab*, for which it is used indifferently in the Hebrew as applied to either of two men in certain passages; but these have not been accurately represented in the A.V. which applies the briefer form indeed to either, but the full form to but one in three of these passages. *SEE JEHONADAB.*

- 1.** The son of Shimeah and nephew of David (A.V. correctly in ^{<403>}2 Samuel 13:3 twice, 32, 35; incorrectly in ver. 5, where the Hebrew has Jehonadab).
- 2.** The Rechabite (^{<4816>}Jeremiah 35:6, 10, 19; incorrectly in verse 8, 14, 16, 18).

Jo'nah

(Heb. *Yonah'*, *hn/y*, a *dove*, as often, but in that sense fem., Sept. *Ἰωνά* in ^{<2425>}2 Kings 14:25; elsewhere and in the N.T. *Ἰωνᾶς*: *SEE JONAS*), the son of Amittai, the fifth in order of the minor prophets. No era is assigned to him in the book of his prophecy, yet there is little doubt of his being the same person who is spoken of in ^{<2425>}2 Kings 14:25 as having uttered a prophecy of the relief of the kingdom of Israel, which was accomplished by

Jeroboam's recapture of the ancient territory of the northern tribes between Coele-Syria and the Ghor (compare ver. 29). The Jewish doctors; have supposed him to be the son of the widow of Sarepta by a puerile interpretation of ^{<1172>}1 Kings 17:24 (Jerome, *Proefat. in Jonam*). His birthplace was Gath-hepher, in the tribe of Zebulon (^{<1245>}2 Kings 14:25). Jonah flourished in or before the reign of Jeroboam II (B.C. cir. 820), since he predicted the successful conquests, enlarged territory, and brief prosperity of the Israelitish kingdom under that monarch's sway (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 9, 10, 1). The oracle itself is not extant, though Hitzig has, by a novel process of criticism, amused himself with a fancied discovery of it in chaps. 15 and 16 of Isaiah (*Des Proph. Jonah Orakel. über Moab kritisch vindicirt*, etc., Heidelb. 1831).

Picture for Jonah

The personal history of Jonah is, with the exception of this incidental allusion, to be gathered from the account in the book that bears his name. Having already, as it seems (from **w** in 1:1), prophesied to Israel, he was sent to Nineveh. The time was one of political revival in Israel; but ere long the Assyrians were to be employed by God as a scourge upon them. The Israelites consequently viewed them with repulsiveness; and the prophet, in accordance with his name (**hn/y**, "a dove"), out of timidity and love for his country, shrunk from a commission which he felt sure would result (^{<342>}Jonah 4:2) in the sparing of a hostile city. He attempted, therefore, to escape to Tarshish, either Tartessus in Spain (Bochart, Titcomb, Hengstenberg), or more probably (Drake) Tarsus in Cilicia, a port of commercial intercourse. The providence of God, however watched over him, first in a storm, and then in his being swallowed by a large fish (**l wd gD**) for the space of three days and three nights (see Hauber, *Jonas im Bauche des Wallfisches* [Lemg. 1753]; Delitzsch, in *Zeitschr. f. Luther. Kirche u. Theol.* 11840], 2, 112 sq.; Baumgarten, *ibid.* [1841], 2, 187; Keil, *Bibl. Commentar zu d. Kl. Propheten* [Leipz. 1866]). After his deliverance Jonah executed his commission; and the king, having heard of his miraculous deliverance (dean Jackson. *On the Creed*, bk. 9, c. 42), ordered a general fast; and averted the threatened judgment. But the prophet, not from personal, but national feelings, grudged the mercy shown to a heathen nation. He was therefore taught, by the significant lesson of the "gourd," whose growth and decay (a known fact to naturalists: Layard's *Nineveh*, 1, 123, 124) brought the truth at once home to him, that

he was sent to testify by deed, as other prophets would afterwards testify by word, of the capacity of Gentiles for salvation, and the design of God to make them partakers of it. This was "the sign of the prophet Jonas" (<Q112> Luke 11:29-32), which was given to a proud and perverse generation of Jews after the ascension of Christ by the preaching of his apostles. (See the monographs on this subject cited by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 160). But the resurrection of Christ itself was also shadowed forth in the history of the prophets, as is made certain to us by the words of our Savior (see Jackson as above, bk. 9, c. 40). Titcomb (*Bible Studies*, p. 237, note) sees a correspondence between <Q117> Jonah 1:17 and <Q118> Hosea 6:2. Besides this, the fact and the faith of Jonah's prayer in the belly of the fish betokened to the nation of Israel the intimation of a resurrection and of immortality.

On what portion of the coast Jonah was set down in safety we are not informed. The opinions held as to the peculiar spot by rabbins and other thaumaturgic expositors need not be repeated. According to modern tradition, it was at the spot now marked as Khan Nebi Yunas, near Sidon (Kelly's *Syria*, p. 302). The particular plant (<Q119> /yayq, *kikayon*, "gourd") which sheltered Jonah was possibly the *Ricinus*, whose name *Kiki* is yet preserved in some of the tongues of the East. It is more likely, however, to have been some climbing plant of the gourd tribe. The Sept. renders it <Q120> κολοκύνθη. Jerome translates it *hedera*, but against his better judgment and for fear of giving offense to the critics of his age, as he quietly adds in justification of his less preferable rendering, "Sed timuimus grammaticos." (See an elucidation of the passage in the *Beitr. zur Beförd.* etc. 19, p. 183.)
SEE GOURD.

Various spots have been pointed out as the place of his sepulchre, such as Mosul in the East, and Gath-hepher in Palestine; while the so called Epiphanius speaks of his retreating to Tyre, and being buried there in the tomb of Cenezaeus, judge of Israel. (See Otho, *Lexicon Rabb.* p. 326 sq.; comp. Ephraem Syrus' *Repentance of Nineveh*, transl. by Dr. Burgess, Lord. 1853.) Apocryphal prophecies ascribed to Jonah may be found in the pseudo-Epiphanius (*De Vitis Prophet.* c. 16) and the *Chronic. Paschale*, p. 149.

Jonah's Prophecy

contains the above account of the prophet's commission to denounce Nineveh, and of his refusal to undertake the embassy of the method he

employed to escape the unwelcome task, and the miraculous means which God used to curb his self-willed spirit, and subdue his petulant and querulous disposition (Reindel, *Die Sendung d. Proph. Jonas nach Ninive*. Bamb. 1826). His attempt to flee from the presence of the Lord seems like a partial insanity, produced by the excitement of distracting motives in an irascible and melancholy heart (J. C. Lange, *Diss. de mirabili fuga Jonoe*, Hal. 1751).

I. *Historical Character of the Book.* — The history of Jonah is certainly striking and extraordinary. Its characteristic prodigy does not resemble the other miraculous phenomena recorded in Scripture, yet we must believe in its literal occurrence, as the Bible affords no indication of its being a mythus, allegory, or parable (Piper, *Historie Jonoe a recentior. conatibus vindicata*, (Tryph. 1786). On the other hand, our Savior's pointed and peculiar allusion to it is a presumption of its reality (~~☞~~ Matthew 12:40). The historical character of the narrative is held by Hess, Lilienthal, Sack, Reindel, Hävernick, Hengstenberg, Laberenz, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, Welte, Stuart, and Keil, *Einleitung*, sec. 89. (See Friedrichsen, *Krit. Uebersicht der verschied. Ansichten on dem Buch Jonas*, 2d edit. 1841.) The opinion of the earlier Jews (Tobit 14:4, 8; 3 Macc. 6:8; Josephus, *Ant.* 9, 10, 2) is also in favor of the literality of the adventure (see Buddei *Hist. V. Test.* 2, 589 sq.). It requires less faith to credit this simple excerpt from Jonah's biography than to believe the numerous hypotheses that have been invented to deprive it of its supernatural character, the great majority of them being clumsy and far fetched, doing violence to the language, and despite to the spirit of revelation; distinguished, too, by tedious adjustments, laborious combinations, historical conjecture, and critical jugglery. In vindication of the reality of this striking narrative, it may be argued that the allusions of Christ to Old Testament events on similar occasions are to actual occurrences (~~☞~~ John 3:14, 6:48); that the purpose which God had in view justified his miraculous interposition; that this miracle must have had a salutary effect both on the minds of the Ninevites and on the people of Israel. Neither is the character of Jonah improbable. Many reasons might induce him to avoid the discharge of his prophetic duty — fear of being thought a false prophet, scorn of a foreign and hostile race, desire for their utter destruction, a false dignity which might reckon it beneath his prerogative to officiate among uncircumcised idolaters (Verschuir, *Opusc.* p. 73, etc.; Alber, *Institut. Hermen. Vet. Test.* 3, 393, 407; Jahn, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, transl. by Turner, p.

372, 373, translator's notes; Laberenz, *De Vera. lib. Jonoe Interp.* Fulda, 1836).

Others regard this book as an allegory, such as Bertholdt and Rosenmüller, Gesenius and Winer. Especially have many deemed it a parody upon or even the original of the various heathen fables of Arion and the Dolphin (Herodot. 1, 21), and the wild adventure of Hercules which is referred to in Lycophron (*Cassandra*, 5, 33; see Forbiger, *De Lycophr. Cassandra c. epimetro de. ona*, Lips. 1827; comp. *Iliad*, 20, 145, 21, 442; Diod. Sic. 4, 42, Philostr. *Icon.* 12; Hygin. *Fab.* 89; Apollod. 2, 5, 9) and Perseus (Apollod. 2, 4, 3; Ovid, *Metam.* 4, 662 sq.; Hygin. 64; Phot. *Cod.* 186, p. 231), Joppa being even famous as the scene of Andromeda's exposure (Pliny, 5, 14, 34; 9, 4; Strabo, 16, 759). Cyrill Alexand., in his *Comment. in Jonah* notices this similitude between the incident of Jonah and the fabled enterprise of the son of Alcmena (see Allat. *Excerpt. var.* p. 274; Eudocia Viol. in Villoison's *Anec. Gr.* 1, 344; Anton, *Comparatio librorum V.T. et scriptor. profan. cet.* p. 10, Gorlic. 1831; compare, too, Theophylact, *Opp.* 4, 169). Bleek justly says (*Einleit.* p. 576) that there is not the smallest probability of the story of Jonah's temporary sojourn in the belly of the whale having been either mediately or immediately derived from those Greek fables. F. von Baur's hypothesis of the story of the book being a compound of some popular Jewish traditions and the Babylonian myth respecting a sea monster Oannes, and the fast for Adonis, is now universally regarded as exploded. For further discussion of this part of Jonah's history, see Gesenius, in the *Hall. Lit.-Zeit.* 1813, No. 23; Friedrichsen, *Krit. Ueberblick der Ansichten vom Jonas* (Leipz. 1841); Delitzsch, in Rudelbach's *Zeitschrift*, 1840, 2, 112 sq. These legendary parallels may be seen drawn out at length by professor Stowe in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for Oct. 1853, p. 744 sq. **SEE JOPPA.**

Some, who cannot altogether reject the reality of the narrative, suppose it to have had a historical basis, though its present form be fanciful or mythical. Such an opinion is the evident result of a mental struggle between receiving it as a real transaction, or regarding it as wholly a fiction (Goldhorn, *Excurs. z. B. Jonah* p. 28; Friedrichsen, *Krit. Ueberblick der Ansichten B. Jonah* p. 219). Grimm, in his *Uebersetz.* p. 61, regards it as a dream produced in that sleep which fell upon Jonah as he lay in the sides of the ship. The fanciful opinion of the famous Herman von der Hardt, in his *Jonas in lace*, etc., a full abstract of which is given by Rosenmüller (*Prolegom. in Jonam*, p. 19), was, that the book is a historical allegory,

descriptive of the fate of Manasseh, and Josiah his grandson, kings of Judah. Tarshish, according to him, represents the kingdom of Lydia; the ship, the Jewish republic, whose captain was Zadok the high priest; while the casting of Jonah into the sea symbolized the temporary captivity of Manasseh in Babylon. Less (*Vom historischen Styl der Urwelt*) supposed that all difficulty might be removed by imagining that Jonah, when thrown into the sea, was taken up by a ship having a large fish for a figure head a theory somewhat more pleasing than the rancid hypothesis of Anton, who fancied that the prophet took refuge in the interior of a dead whale, floating near the spot where he was cast overboard (Rosenm. *Prolegom. in Jonah* p. 328). Not unlike the opinion of Less is that of Charles Taylor, in his Fragments affixed to Calmet's *Dictionary*, No. 145, that **gD** signifies a life preserver, a notion which, as his manner is, he endeavors to support by mythological metamorphoses founded on the form and names of the famous fish god of Philistia. There are others who allow, as De Wette and Knobel, that Jonah was a real person, but hold that the book is made up, for didactic purposes, of legendary stories which had gathered around him. A slender basis of fact has been allowed by some — by Bunsen, for example, who, strangely enough, fixes upon the very portion which to most of his rationalistic countrymen bears the clearest marks of spuriousness, as the one genuine part of the whole — Jonah's thanksgiving from the perils of shipwreck (as Bunsen judges); and thinks that some one had mistaken the matter, and fabricated out of it the present story — by others, such as Krahmer (*Das Buch Jonas*, introd.), who suppose that Jonah was known to have uttered a prophecy against Nineveh, and to have been impatient at the delay which appeared in the fulfilment, and was hence, for didactic purposes, made the hero of the story.

But the more common opinion in the present day with this school of divines is, that the story is purely moral, and without any historical foundation; nor can any clue be found or imagined in the known history of the times why Jonah in particular, a prophet of Israel in the latter stages of the kingdom, should have been chosen as the ground of the instruction meant to be conveyed. So Ewald, Bleek, etc., who, however, differ in some respects as to the specific aim of the book, while they agree as to its non-historical character. In short, that the book is the grotesque coinage of a Hebrew imagination seems to be the opinion, variously modified, of Semler, Michaelis, Herder, Stäudlin, Eichhorn, Augusti, Meyer, Pareau, Hitzig, and Maurer.

The plain, literal import of the narrative being set aside with misapplied ingenuity, the supposed design of it has been very variously interpreted. Michaelis (*Uebersetz. d. N.T.* part 11, p. 101) and Semler (*Apparat. ad Lib. Vet. Test. Interpret.* p. 271) supposed the narrative to be intended to show the injustice of the arrogance and hatred cherished by the Jews towards other nations. So in substance Bleek. Similarly Eichhorn (*Einleit.* § 577) and Jahn (*Introduct.* § 127) think the design was to teach the Jews that other people with less privileges excelled them in pious obedience. Kegel (*Bibel d. A. und N. Test.* 7, 129 sq.) argues that this episode was meant to solace and excite the prophets under the discharge of difficult and dangerous duties; while Paulus (*Memorabilia*, 6, 32 sq.) maintains that the object of the author of *Jonah* is to impress the fact that God remits punishment on repentance and reformation. Similar is the idea of Kimchi and Pareau (*Interpretation of Old Testament*, Biblical Cabinet, No. 25, p. 263). Krahmer thinks that the theme of the writer is the Jewish colony in its relation to the Samaritans (*Das B. Jon. Krit. untersucht*, p. 65). Maurer (*Comment. in Proph. Min.*) adheres to the opinion which lies upon the surface, that it inculcates the sin of not obeying God, even in pronouncing severe threatenings on a heathen people. Ewald would make the design quite general, namely, to show how the true fear of God and repentance bring salvation — first, in the case of the heathen sailors; then in the case of Jonah: finally, in that of the Ninerites. Hitzig (first in a separate treatise, then in his commentary on the minor prophets) supposes the book to have been written by someone in the 4th century before Christ, "in Egypt, that land of wonders," and chiefly for the purpose of vindicating Jehovah for having failed to verify the prophecy in Obadiah respecting the heathen Edomites. Similarly, Köster (*Die Prophetens des A. und N. Test.*, Leipz. 18, 9) favors the malignant insinuation that its chief end was to save the credit of the prophets among the people, though their predictions against foreign nations might not be fulfilled, as Nineveh was preserved after being menaced and doomed.

These hypotheses are all vague and baseless, and do not merit a special refutation. Endeavoring to free us from one difficulty, they plunge us into others yet more intricate and perplexing. We notice the principal external objections that have been brought against the book.

(1.) Much profane wit has been expended on the miraculous means of Jonah's deliverance, very unnecessarily and very absurdly; it is simply said, "The Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah." Now the

species of marine animal is not defined, and the Greek κῆτος is often used to specify, not the genus whale, but any large fish or sea monster. All objections to its being a whale which lodged Jonah in its stomach, from its straitness of throat or rareness of haunt in the Mediterranean, are thus removed. Hesychius explains κῆτος as θαλάσσιος ἰχθύς παμμεγέθης. Eustathius explains its correspondent adjective κητώεσσα by μεγάλην (in the *Iliad*, 2:581). Diodorus Siculus speaks of terrestrial monsters as κητώδη ζῶα, and describes a huge fish as κῆτος ἄπιστον τὸ μέγεθος. The Scripture thus speaks only of an enormous fish, which under God's direction swallowed the prophet, and does not point out the species to which the voracious prowler belonged. There is little ground for the supposition of bishop Jebb, that the asylum of Jonah was not in the stomach of a whale, but in a cavity of its throat, which, according to naturalists, is a very capacious receptacle, sufficiently large, as captain Scoresby asserts, to contain a merchant *ship's jolly boat* full of men (bishop Jebb, *Sacred Literature*, p. 178). Since the days of Bochart it has been a common opinion that the fish was of the shark species, *Lamia canis carcharias*, or "sea dog" (Bochart, *Op.* 3, 72; Calmet's *Dissertation sur Jonah*). Entire human bodies have been found in some fishes of this kind. The stomach, too, has no influence on any living substance admitted into it. Granting all these facts as proof of what is termed the economy of miracles, still must we say, in reference to the supernatural preservation of Jonah, Is anything too hard for the Lord? **SEE WHALE.**

(2.) What is said about the size of Nineveh, also, is in accordance with fact (see *Pict. Bible*, note, ad loc.). It was "an exceeding great city of three days' journey." Built in the form of a parallelogram, it made, according to Diodorus (2:7), a circuit of 480 furlongs, or about 60 miles. It has been usual, since the publication of Layard's *Nineveh*, to say that the great ruins of Koyunjik, Nimrûd, Keremles, and Khorsabad form such a parallelogram, the distances from north to south being about 18 miles, and from east to west about 12; the longer sides thus measuring 36 miles, and the shorter ones 24. But against this view professor Rawlinson has recently urged, with considerable force, that the four great ruins bore distinct local titles; that Nimrûd, identified with Calah, is mentioned in Scripture as a place so far separated from Nineveh that "a great city" Resen lay between them (^{<0102>}Genesis 10:12); that there are no signs of a continuous town; and that the four sites are fortified "on what would be the inside of the city." Still Nineveh, as represented by the ruins of Koyunjik and Nebbi-Yunus, or

Tomb of Jonah, was of an oblong shape, with a circuit of about eight miles, and was therefore a place of unusual size" an exceeding great city." The phrase, "three days' journey," may mean that it would take that time to traverse the city and proclaim through all its localities the divine message; and the emphatic point then is, that at the end of his first day's journey the preaching of Jonah took effect. The clause, "that cannot discern their right hand from their left hand," probably denotes children, and 120,000 of these might represent a population of more than half a million (Rawlinson's *Five Great Monarchies*, 1, 310; Sir Henry Rawlinson's *Comment. on Cuneif. Inscriptions*, p. 17; Captain Jones's *Topography of Nineveh, in the Jour. of As. Society*, 15, 298). Jonah entered the city "a day's journey," that is, probably went from west to east uttering his incisive and terrible message. The sublime audacity of the stranger the ringing monotony of his sharp, short cry had an immediate effect. The story of his wonderful deliverance had perhaps preceded him (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 100). The people believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and man and beast fasted alike. The exaggeration ascribed to, this picture adds to its credibility, so prone is Oriental nature to extremes. If the burden of Jonah was to have any effect at all, one might say that it must be profound and immediate. It was a panic we dare not call it a revival, or, with Dr. Pusey, dignify it into conversion. There was plainly no permanent result. After the sensation had passed away, idolatry and rapacity resumed their former sway, as is testified by the prophets Isaiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah; yet the appalled conscience of Nineveh did confess its "evil and its violence" as it groveled in the dust. Various causes *may have* contributed to deeper this consternation — the superstition of the people, and the sudden and unexplained appearance of the foreigner with his voice of doom. "The king," as Layard says, "might believe him to be a special minister from the supreme deity of the nation," and it was only "" when the gods themselves seemed to interpose that any check was placed on the royal pride and lust." Layard adds, "It was not necessary to the effect of his preaching that Jonah should be of the religion of the people of Nineveh. I have known a Christian priest frighten a whole Mussulman town to tents and repentance by publicly proclaiming that he had received a divine mission to announce a coming earthquake or plague" (*Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 632). The compulsory mourning of the brute creation has at least one analogy in the lamentation made over the Persian general Masistius: "The horses and beasts of burden were shaved" (Herodotus, 9:24). According to Plutarch, also, Alexander continued the observance of a similar custom on the death of Hephaestion. Therefore, in

the accessories of the narrative there is no violation of probability — all is in accordance with known customs and facts. See Nineveh.

(3.) It has appeared to some, in particular to Bleek (*Einleit.* p. 571), improbable, and against the historical verity of this book, that on the supposition of all that is here related having actually occurred, there should be in the relation of them such a paucity of circumstantial details — nothing said, for instance, of the place where Jonah was discharged on dry land, or of the particular king who then reigned at Nineveh and not only so, but no apparent reference in the future allusions to Nineveh in Scriptura, to the singular change (if so be it actually took place) wrought through the preaching of Jonah on the religious and moral state of the people. These are still always regarded as idolaters, and the judgments of God uttered against them, as if they stood in much the same position with the heathen enemies generally of God's cause and people. It may fairly be admitted that there is a certain degree of strangeness in such things, which, if it were not in accordance with the character both of the man and of the mission, and in these found a kind of explanation, might not unnaturally give rise to some doubts of the credibility of what is written. But Jonah's relation to Nineveh was altogether of a special and peculiar nature; it stood apart from the regular calling of a prophet and the ordinary dealings of God; and having for its more specific object the instruction and warning of the covenant people in a very critical period of their affairs, the reserve maintained as to local and historical details may have been designed, as it was certainly fitted, to make them think less of the parties immediately concerned, and more of what through these God was seeking to impress upon themselves. The whole was a kind of parabolical action; and beyond a certain limit circumstantial minuteness would have tended to mar, rather than to promote, the leading aim. Then, as to the change produced upon the Ninevites, we are led from the nature of the case to think chiefly of the more flagrant iniquities as the evils more particularly cried against; and Israel itself afforded many examples of general reformation in respect to these, of which little or no trace was to be found in the course even of a single generation. Much more might such be expected to have happened in the case of Nineveh.

II. *Style, Date, etc.* — The book of Jonah is a simple narrative, with the exception of the prayer or thanksgiving in chap. 2. Its style and mode of narration are uniform. There are no traces of compilation, as Nachtigall supposed; neither is the prayer, as De Wette (*Einleit.* § 237) imagines,

improperly borrowed from some other sources. That prayer contains, indeed, not only imagery peculiar to itself, but also such imagery as at once was suggested to the mind of a pious Hebrew preserved in circumstances of extreme jeopardy. On this principle we account for the similarity of some portions of its phraseology to ^{<1850>}Psalm 59:42, etc. The language in both places had been hallowed by frequent usage, and had become the consecrated idiom of a distressed and succored Israelite.. Perhaps the prayer of Jonah might be uttered by him, not during his mysterious imprisonment, but after it (**hgDhiy [M]næ**, *out*, i.e. when out of the fish's belly; comp. ^{<1850>}Job 19:26; 11:15). The hymn seems to have been composed after his deliverance. and the reason why his deliverance is noted after the hymn is recorded may be to show the occasion of its composition. "The Lord had spoken unto the fish, and it had vomited Jonah on the dry land!" (See further Hauber, in his *Bibl. Betrachtungen*, Lemgo, 1753; also an article on the subject in the *Brit. Theol. Mag.* 1, 3., p. 18.) There was little reason either for dating the composition of this book later than the age of Jonah, or for supposing it the production of another than the prophet himself. The Chaldaisms which Jahn and others find may be accounted for by the nearness of the canton of Zebulon, to which Jonah belonged, to the northern territory, whence by national intercourse Aramaic peculiarities might be insensibly borrowed. (Thus we have **hnypæ** — *a ship with a deck* — not the more common Hebrew term; **bri** — a foreign title applied to the captain; **hlnmæ** *to appoint* — found, however, in Psalm 61, a psalm which Hupfeld without any valid grounds places after the Babylonian captivity; **rma**; *to command*, as in the later books; **µ[ifi** *command*, referring to the royal decree, and probably taken from the native Assyrian tongue; **µ[j** ; *to row*, a nautical term; and the abbreviated form of the relative, which, however, occurs in other books, etc.) Gesenius and Bertholdt place it before the exile; Jahn and Koster after it. Rosenmüller supposes the author may have been a contemporary of Jeremiah; Hitzig postpones it to the period of the Maccabees. The general opinion is that Jonah was the first of the prophets (Rosenmüller, Bp. Lloyd, Davison, Browne, Drake): Hengstenberg would place him after Amos and Hosea, and, indeed, adheres to the order of the books in the canon for. the chronology. He, as well as Hitzig, would identify the author with that of Obadiah, chiefly on account of the initial "and." The king of Nineveh at this time is supposed (Usher and others) to have been Pul, who is placed by Layard (*Nim. and Bab.* p. 624) at B.C. 750; but an earlier king,

Adrammelech II, B.C. 840, is regarded as more probable by Drake. The date above assigned to Jonah would seem to indicate the husband of the famous Semiramis. *SEE ASSYRIA.*

III. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps expressly on the whole book, the most important of which we designate by prefixing an asterisk: Ephraem Syrus, *In Jonam* (in *Opp.* 3, 562; transl. from the Syriac by Burgess, *Homily*, Lond. 1853, 12mo); Basil, *In Jonam* (in *Opp.* p. 66); Tertullian, *Carmen* (in *Opp.* p. 576); Theophylact, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 4); Brentius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 4); Luther, *Auslegung* (Wittenb. 1526, 4to and 8vo; Erf. 1526, 1531, 8vo; also in *Werke*, Wittenb. ed. 5, 310; Jen. 3, 214; Alt. 3, 351; Lpz. 8, 516; Hal. 6, 496; in Latin, by Jonas, in *Opp.* Vitemb. 4, 404; and separately by Opsoppaeus, Hag. 1526, 8vo; and Loneke, Argent. 1526, 8vo); Artopoeus, *Commentarius* (Stet. 1545, Basil, 1558, 8vo); Bugenhagen, *Expositio* (Vitemb. 1550, 1561, 8vo); Hooper, *Sermons* (London, 1550, 12mo; also in *Writings*, p. 431); Ferus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1554, Antw. 1557, Ven. 1567, 8vo; also in German, Cöln, 1567, 8vo); Willich, *Commentarius* [includ. sev. minor proph.] (Basil. 1566, 8vo); Selnecker, *Auslegung* [including Nahum, etc.]. (Lpz. 1567, 4to); Tuscan, *Commentarius* (Ven. 1573, 8vo); Calvin, *Lectures* (trans. by Baxter, Lond. 1578, 4to); Pomarius, *Auslegung* (Magdeb. 1579, Lpz. 1599, 4to; Stettin, 1664, 8vo); Baron, *Prelectiones* (ed. Lake, Lond. 1579, folio); Grynaeus, *Enarratio* (Basil. 1581, 8vo); Schadaeus, *Synopsis* (Argent. 1588, 4to); Junius, *Lectiones* (Heidelb. 1594, 4to; also in *Opp.* 1, 1327); *King, *Lectures* (Lond. 1594, 1600, 1611, 1618; Oxf. 1597, 1599, 4to); Feuarent, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1594, folio; 1595, 8vo); Abbott, *Exposition* (Lond. 1600, 1613, 4to; 1845, 2 vols. 12mo); Wolderus, *Diexodus* [includ. Joel] (Vitemb. 1605, 4to) Krackewitz, *Commentarius* (Hamb. 1610, Giessen, 1611, 8vo); Miley, *Erklärung* (Heidelb. 1614, 4to); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1616, 1626, 4to); Schnepf, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1619, 4to); Quarles, *Poem* (Lond. 1620, 4to); Treminius, *Commentarii* (Oriolse, 1623, 4to); Mylius, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1624, Regiom. 1640, 4to; also in his *Sylloge*, Amst. 1701, fol., p. 976 sq.); Urven, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1640, fol.); Acosta, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1641, fol.); Ursinus, *Commentaries* (Francof. 1642, 8vo); Paciuchelli, *Lezzioni* (Ven. 1650, 1660., 1664, 1701, folio also in Latin, Monach. 1672, fol.; Antw. 1681-3, 3 vols. fol.); De Salinas, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1652 sq., 3 vols. fol.); Crocius, *Commentarius* (Cassel. 1656, 8vo); Leusden,

Paraphrasis [Rabbinical] (Tr. ad Rh. 1656, 8vo); Petraeus, *Notes* [to a transl. from the Aeth.] (L.B. 1660, 4to); *Scheid, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1659, 1665, 4to); Gerhard, *Annotationes* [includ. Amos] (Jen. 1663, 1676, 4to); Pfeiffer, *Prelectiones* (Vitemb. 1671, 1706, Lipsiae, 1686, 4to; also in *Opp.* 1, 1131 sq.); Moebius, *Jonas typicus* (Lips. 1678, 4to); Christianus, *Illustratio* (Lips. 1683, 8vo); Bircherod, *Expositio* (Hafn. 1686, 4to); Von der Hardt, *Enigmata*, etc. (Helmstadt, in separate treatises, 1719; together, 1723, fol.); Outhof, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1723, 4to); Steuersloot, *Ontleeding* (Leyden, 1730, 4to); Van der Meer, *Verklaaring* (Gor. 1742, 4to); Reichenbach, *De Rabbins errantibus*, etc. (Alt. 1761, 4to); Lessing, *Observationes* (Chemnitz, 1780, 8vo); Lavater, *Predigten* (Wintenth. 1782, 2 vols. 8vo); Adam, *Sendungsgeschichte*, etc. (Bonn, 1786, 4to); Piper, *Vindicatio* (Gryph. 1786, 4to); Lüderwald, *Allegorie*, etc. (Helmstadt, 1787, 8vo); Höpfner, *Cure in Sept.*, etc. (Lips. 1787-8, 3 parts 4to); Kordes, *Observationes in Sept.*, etc. (Jena, 1788, 4to); Löwe, *rWaBæ* (Berl. 1788, 8vo; also in his general commentary, Dessau, 1805); Grimm, *Erklärung* (Düsseld. 1789, 8vo); Fabricius, *Commentarius*, etc. [from Jewish sources] (Gott. 1792, 8vo); Grangaard, *Uebersetzung* (Lpzg. 1792, 8vo); Paulus, *Zweck*, etc. (in his *Memorabilien*, Leipzig, 1794, 6, 32 sq.); Griesdorf, *Interpretandi ratio*, etc. (Vitemb. 1794, 2 dissert. 4to); Benjoin, *Notes* (Cambr. 1796, 4to); Nachtigall, *Aufschrift*, etc. (in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek*, Lips. 1799, 9:221 sq.); Elias of Wilna, *vWlRPe* Wilna, 1800, 4to); Goldhorn, *Excuse* (Lpz. 1803, 8vo); Jones, *Portrait*, etc. (London, 1810, and often since, 12mo); *Friedrichsen, *Ueberblick*, etc. (Alt. 1817, Lpz. 1841, 8vo); Young, *Lectures* (London, 1819, 8vo); Reindel, *Versuch*, etc. (Bamberg, 1826, 8vo); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (part 7, vol. 2; Lpzg. 1827, 8vo); Hitzig, *Orakel ub. Moab* (Heidelb. 1831, 4to); Cunningham, *Lectures* (Lond. 1833, 12mo); Sibthorp, *Lectures* (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Krahmer, *Untersuchung* (Kassel. 1839, 8vo). Preston, *Lectures* (London, 1840, 8vo); Jäger, *Endzweck*, etc. (Tüb. 1840, 8vo); Peddie, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1862, 12mo); Fairbairn, *Jonah's Life*, etc. (Edinburgh, 1849, 12mo); Macpherson, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1849, 12mo); Tweedie, *Lessors* (Edinb. 1850, 12mo); Drake, *Notes* [including Hosea] (Cambr. 1853, 8vo); Harding, *Lectures* (Lond. 1856, 12mo); Muir, *Lessons* (Edinb. 1854, 1857, 8vo); Wright, *Glossaries*, etc. (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Desprez, *Illustrations* (London, 1857, 12mo); Broad, *Lectures* (Lond. 1860, 8vo); *Kaulen, *Expositio* (Mogunt. 1862, 8vo); *Martin, *Jonah's Mission* (Lond. 1866, 8vo). *SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.*

Jonah Ben-Abraham Gerundi,

a Jewish savant, and one of the principal leaders of the opposition to the school of Maimonides, was born about 1195. A disciple of the celebrated Salomo of Montpensier, he had espoused the cause of the latter. He was one of the parties that pronounced the ban against all who should dare to read the writings of the celebrated Jewish philosopher, and his opposition had in every way been so bitter against the Maimonidists that it caused no little surprise in the Jewish camp when he, upon the attempt of the inquisitors to destroy all copies of the Rabbinical writings, openly declared his former course a mistake, and pronounced the second Moses a great and good man. He even entered upon a pilgrimage to the grave of the man whose writings and disciples he had formerly opposed; and when, at the solicitation of a Jewish congregation which demanded his services, he halted on the journey, and there died (about 1270), his death was attributed by some of his superstitious brethren as a punishment of heaven for the nonfulfilment of his duty to visit the grave of Maimonides, and there declare the folly of his former course. Jonah was a man of splendid parts, and did much to allay strife among his people. Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7, 46, 117 sq. *SEE SALOMO OF MONTPENSIER.* (J.H.W.)

Jo'nan

(Ἰωνάν, perh. contr. for JONATHAN or JOHANAN, or i.q. JONAS), the son of Eliakim and father of Joseph among the maternal ancestors of Christ (^{<0180>}Luke 3:30). He is not mentioned in the Old Test. B.C. considerably ante 876. *SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.*

Jo'nas

(Ἰωνᾶς, for the Heb. *Jonah*), the Graecized form of the name of three men in the Apocrypha and New Testament.

1. The prophet JONAH (2 Esdr. 1, 39; Tobit 14:4, 8; ^{<0129>}Matthew 12:39, 40, 41; 16:4; ^{<0119>}Luke 11:29, 30, 32).
2. A person occupying the same position in 1 Esdr. 9:23 as ELIEZER in the corresponding list in ^{<0103>}Ezra 10:23. Perhaps the corruption originated in reading yny[yl a for rz[yl a, as appears to have been the case in 1 Esdr. 9:32 (compare ^{<0101>}Ezra 10:31). The former would have caught the

compiler's eye from ^{<5122>}Ezra 10:22, and the original form Elionas, as it appears in the Vulg., could easily have become Jonas.

3. The father of the apostle Peter (^{<4215>}John 21:15, 16, 17). In ^{<4042>}John 1:42 the name is less correctly Anglicized "Jona" (some MSS. have Ἰωάννης). A.D. ante 25. *SEE BAR-JONA*. Instead of Ἰωνᾶ (genitive) in all the above passages, good codices have Ἰωάννου or Ἰωάνου, which latter Lachmann has introduced into the text. Perhaps *Jonas* is but a contraction for *Joannas* (^{<4127>}Luke 3:27), which is the same as *John*.

Jonas, Bishop Of Orleans,

an eminent prelate in the Latin Church, flourished in the first half of the 9th century. He died in 842. Jonas took an active part in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and played no unimportant part in the Iconoclastic controversy, in which he assumed a mediate course. In his *De cultu Imaginum* (1645, 16mo) he wrote both against Claudius, bishop of Turin, and the Iconoclasts. The work was dedicated to king Charles the Bald, with whom he was in great favor. Although condemning the destroyers of images, he did not approve the worship of them, and the most eminent Catholic writers, such as Bellarmine, therefore disapprove of his work. His other principal works are, *Libri tres de institutionibus laicali* (transl. into French by De Mege, 1662, 12mo): — *De institutione regia* (transl. into French by Desmarests, 1661, 8vo). These two works are to be found in Latin in D'Achery's *Spicileg*. He is also the author of a treatise on *Miracles* (in *Bibl. Patri.*). See Milman, *Latin Christ.* 4, 421; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, 23, 294 sq., 416 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 573.

Jonas, Justus

one of the most eminent reformers in Germany, a contemporary and associate of Luther. was born at Nordhausen, June 5, 1493. He studied law at the University of Erfurt. In 1519, however, encouraged by the advice of both Hess and Erasmus, he decided to study theology, and, inclining to the cause of the Reformers, he allied himself to Luther in 1521, and thereafter became closely connected with the great reformer. He went to Worms with him, and was soon after appointed provost of the church at Wittenberg. Here he was made D.D. by the university, in which he became a professor, and ever after worked zealously for the propagation of the principles of the Reformation. His legal knowledge was of especial service to the Reformers. In 1529 he accompanied Luther to Marburg, and his letters on

this occasion are a valuable historical contribution. In 1530 we find him assisting Melancthon in the completion of his *Augustana*. In 1541 he removed to Halle to assume pastoral duties at St. Mary's Church in that city, but in 1546 duke Maurice ordered him to quit the place, and he returned only after the elector John Frederick had taken possession of the city in 1547. The battle of Mühlberg, which falls in this year, again turned the fate of the Protestants, and he once more quitted Halle. In 1551 he was appointed court preacher at Coburg, and in 1553 superintendent of Eisfeld, where he died Oct. 9, 1555. Jonas was particularly distinguished as a ready speaker and as a writer. He took part in the translation of the Bible by Luther, and wrote *Proefatio in Epistolas divi Pauli Apostoli, ad Corinthios*, etc. (Erfurt, 1520, 4to): — *Epitome Judicii J. Jonoe, proepos. Wittemb., de corrigendis coerimoniis* (1523): — *Annotationes J. Jonoe in Aeta Apostolorum* (Wittenb. 1524, Basle, 1525): — *Vom alten u. neuen Gott, Glauben u. Lehre* (Wittenb. 1526): — *Welch die rechte Kirche, und dagegen welch d. falsche Kirche ist* (Wittenb. 1534, 4to): — *Oratio Justi Jonoe, doct. theol., de Studiis Theologicis* (Wittemb. 1539; Melancthon, *Select. Declamat.* 1, 23): *Des 20 Psalms Auslegung* (Wittemberg, 1546): — *Kurze Historia v. Luthers biblischen u. geistlichen Anfechtungen* (in Luther's Works); etc. He also published a number of translations into German, especially of works of Luther and Melancthon; also translations from German into Latin. See Reinhard, *Commentatio hist. theolog. de Vita et Obitu Justi Jonoe*, etc. (Weimar, 1731); Knapp, *Narratio de Justo Jona*, etc. (Halle, 1817; 4to); Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklop.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7, 1 sq.; Pressel, *Leben u. ausgew. Schriften d. Vaters u. Begründers. d. luther. Kirche* (1862), vol. 8.

Jonas, Ludwig

one of the ablest German theologians of our day, was born at Neustadt a. O. February 11, 1797. During the Franco-Prussian war of 1812-1815 he fought against the foreign invader, but as soon as peace dawned on his native land he resumed his theological studies under the celebrated Schleiermacher, of whom he was one of the most prominent and faithful followers. After preaching at different places, he removed to Berlin in 1834, and soon secured a place in the foreground among Berlin's large array of theological writers. He published Schleiermacher's MSS.: his philosophical *Essays and Dissertations* in 1835, the *Dialectic* in 1839, *Morals* in 1843, *Letters* in 1858. He died Sept. 19, 1859. Jonas was one of the founders of the *Monatsschrift* of the United Church of Prussia

(comprising the Reformed and Lutheran churches at that time. *SEE PRUSSIA*).

Jon'athan

(Heb. *Yonathan*, $\hat{t}n/y$, ^{<0932>}1 Samuel 13:2, 3, 16, 22; 14:1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 17, 21, 27, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49; 19:1; 1 Kings 1, 42, 43; ^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 2:32, 33; 10:2; 11:34; ^{<1306>}Ezra 8:6; 10:15; ^{<1621>}Nehemiah 12:11, 14, 35; ^{<2418>}Jeremiah 40:8; Sept. Ἰωνάθαν), a contracted form of JEHONATHAN ($\hat{t}n/hy$) q.d. *Theodore*, ^{<1375>}1 Chronicles 27:25; ^{<1478>}2 Chronicles 17:8; ^{<1628>}Nehemiah 12:18; Anglicized "Jonathan" elsewhere, ^{<0783>}Judges 18:30 ^{<0946>}1 Samuel 14:6, 8; 18:1, 3, 4; 19:1, 2, 4, 6, 7; 20:1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42; 23:16, 18; 31:2; ^{<1004>}2 Samuel 1:4, 5, 12, 17, 22, 23, 25, 26; 4:4; 9:1, 3, 6, 7; 15:27, 36; 17:17, 20; 21:7, 12, 13, 14, 21; 22:32; ^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 8:33, 34; 9:39, 40; 20:7; 27:32; ^{<2675>}Jeremiah 37:15, 20; 38:26; Sept. Ἰωνάθαν), the name of fifteen or more men in the canonical Scriptures, besides several in the Apocrypha and Josephus.

I. A Levite descended from Gershom, the son of Moses (^{<0783>}Judges 18:30). It is indeed said, in our Masoretic copies, that the Gershom from whom this Jonathan sprang was "the son of Manasseh;" but it is on very good grounds supposed that in the name Moses (*hvm*), the single letter *n* (*n*) has been interpolated (and it is usually written *suspended*, Buxtorf, *Tiber.* p. 14), changing it into Manasseh (*hcnm*), in order to save the character of the great lawgiver from the stain of having an idolater among his immediate descendants (*Baba Bathra*, 109, b). The singular name Gershom, and the date of the transaction, go far to establish this view. Accordingly the Vulgate, and some copies of the, Septuagint, actually exhibit the name of Moses instead of Manasseh. (See Clarke's *Comment.* ad loc.) The *history* of this Jonathan is involved in the narrative which occupies ^{<0770>}Judges 17:18, and is one of the two accounts which form a sort of appendix to that book. The events themselves appear to have occurred soon after the death of Joshua, and of the elders who outlived him, when the government was in a most unsettled state. Its proper place in the chronological order would have been between the second and third chapters of the book. B.C. cir. 1590.

Jonathan, who was resident at Bethlehem, lived at a time when the dues of the sanctuary did not afford a livelihood to the numerous Levites who had a claim upon them, and belonged to a tribe destitute of the landed possessions which gave to all others a sufficient maintenance. He therefore went forth to seek his fortune. In Mount Ephraim he came to "a house of gods," which had been established by one Micah, who wanted nothing but a priest to make his establishment complete. *SEE MICAH*. This person made Jonathan what was manifestly considered the handsome offer of engaging him as his priest for his victuals, a yearly suit of clothes, and ten shekels (about six dollars) a year in money. Here he lived for some time, till the Danite spies, who were sent by their tribe to explore the north, passed this way and formed his acquaintance. When, not long after, the body of armed Danites passed the same way in going to settle near the sources of the Jordan, the spies mentioned Micah's establishment to them, on which they went and took away not only "the ephod, the teraphim, and the graven image," but the priest, also, that they might set up the same worship in the place of which they were going to take possession. Micah vainly protested against this robbery; but Jonathan himself was glad at the improvement in his prospects, and from that time, even down to the captivity, he and his descendants continued to be priests of the Danites in the town of Laish, the name of which was changed to Dan.

There is not any reason to suppose that this establishment, whether in the hands of Micah or of the Danites, involved an apostasy from Jehovah. It appears rather to have been an attempt to localize or domesticate his presence, under those symbols and forms of service which were common among the neighboring nations, but were forbidden to the Hebrews. The offense here was twofold — the establishment of a sacred ritual different from the only one which the law recognized, and the worship by symbols, naturally leading to idolatry, with the ministration of one who could not legally be a priest, but only a Levite. and under circumstances in which no Aaronic priest could legally have officiated. It is more than likely that this establishment was eventually merged in that of the golden calf, which Jeroboam set up in this place, his choice of which may very possibly have been determined by its being already in possession of "a house of gods."

The Targum of R. Joseph, on ^{<12316>}1 Chronicles 23:16, identifies this Jonathan with Shebuel, the son of Gershom, who is there said to have repented (*abWtT]db[*) in his old age, and to have been appointed by David as chief over his treasures. All this arises from a play upon the name

Shebuel, from which this meaning is extracted in accordance with a favorite practice of the Targumist.

II. Second of the two sons of Jada, and grandson of Jerahmeel, of the family of Judah; as his brother Jether died without issue, this branch of the line was continued through the two sons of Jonathan (^{<1192>}1 Chronicles 2:32, 33). B.C. considerably post 1612.

III. The eldest son of king Saul and the bosom friend of David (Josephus ^{Ἰωνάθην}, *Ant.* 6:6,1). He first appears some time after his father's accession (^{<912>}1 Samuel 13:2). If his younger brother Ishbosheth was forty at the time of Saul's, death (^{<1018>}2 Samuel 2:8), Jonathan must have been at least thirty when he is first mentioned. Of his own family we know nothing except the birth of one son, five years before his death (^{<1004>}2 Samuel 4:4). He was regarded in his father's lifetime as heir to the throne. Like Saul, he was a man of great strength and activity (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 1:23), of which the exploit at Michmash was a proof. He was also famous for the peculiar martial exercises in which his tribe excelled — archery and slinging (^{<312>}1 Chronicles 12:2). His bow was to him what the spear was to his father: "*the bow of Jonathan turned not back*" (^{<1022>}2 Samuel 1:22). It was always about him (^{<910>}1 Samuel 18:4; 20:35). It is through his relation with David that he is chiefly known to us, probably as related by his descendants at David's court. But there is a background, not so clearly given, of his relation with his father. From the time that he first appears he is Saul's constant companion. He was always present at his father's meals. As Abner and David seem to have occupied the places afterwards called the captaincies of "the host" and "of the guard," so he seems to have been (as Hushai afterwards) "the friend" (comp. ^{<9125>}1 Samuel 20:25; ^{<1057>}2 Samuel 15:37). The whole story implies, without expressing, the deep attachment of the father and son. Jonathan can only go on his dangerous expedition (^{<9141>}1 Samuel 14:1) by concealing it from Saul. Saul's vow is confirmed, and its tragic effect deepened, by his feeling for his son, "though it be Jonathan my son" (^{<9143>}1 Samuel 14:39). "Tell me what thou hast done" (^{<9143>}1 Samuel 14:43). Jonathan cannot bear to believe his father's enmity to David: "My father will do nothing, great or small, but that he will show it to me and why should my father hide this thing from me? it is not so" (^{<9122>}1 Samuel 20:2). To him, if to any one, the wild frenzy of the king was amenable — "Saul hearkened unto the voice of Jonathan" (^{<9116>}1 Samuel 19:6). Their mutual affection was indeed interrupted by the growth of

Saul's insanity. Twice the father would have sacrificed the son: once in consequence of his vow (1 Samuel 14); the second time, more deliberately, on the discovery of David's flight; and on this last occasion, a momentary glimpse is given of some darker history. Were the phrases "son of a perverse rebellious woman" — "shame on thy mother's nakedness" (^{<0118>}1 Samuel 20:30, 31), mere frantic invectives? or was there something in the story of Ahinoam or Rizpah which we do not know? "In fierce anger" Jonathan left the royal presence (ib. 34). But he cast his lot with his father's decline, not with his friend's rise, and "in death they were not divided" (^{<0113>}2 Samuel 1:23; ^{<01216>}1 Samuel 23:16).

1. The first main part of his career is connected with the war with the Philistines, commonly called, from its locality, "the war of Michmash" (^{<01121>}1 Samuel 13:21, Sept.), as the last years of the Peloponnesian War. were called, for a similar reason, "the war of Decelea." In the previous war with the Ammonites (^{<01104>}1 Samuel 11:4-15) there is no mention of him; and his abrupt appearance, without explanation, in 13:2, may seem to imply that some part of the narrative has been lost. B.C. 1073. He is already of great importance in the state. Of the 3000 men of whom Saul's standing army was formed (13:2; 24:2; 26:1, 2), 1000 were under the command of Jonathan at Gibeah. The Philistines were still in the general command of the country; an officer was stationed at Geba, either the same as Jonathan's position or close to it. In a sudden act of youthful daring, as when Tell rose against Gessler, or as in sacred history Moses rose against the Egyptian, Jonathan slew this officer (Auth. Vers. "garrison," Sept. τὸν Νασίβ, ^{<01133>}1 Samuel 13:3, 4. See Ewald, 2, 476), and thus gave the signal for a general revolt. Saul took advantage of it, and the whole population rose. But it was a premature attempt. The Philistines poured in from the plain, and the tyranny became more deeply rooted than ever. *SEE SAUL.* Saul and Jonathan (with their immediate attendants) alone had arms, amidst the general weakness and disarming of the people (^{<01122>}1 Samuel 13:22). They were encamped at Gibeah, with a small body of 600 men, and as they looked down from that height on the misfortunes of their country, and of their native tribe especially, they wept aloud (Sept. ἔκλαιον, ^{<01136>}1 Samuel 13:16).

From this oppression, as Jonathan by his former act had been the first to provoke it, so now he was the first to deliver his people. On the former occasion Saul had been equally with himself involved in the responsibility of the deed. Saul "blew the trumpet" Saul had "smitten the officer of the

Philistines" (^{<010B>}1 Samuel 13:3, 4). But now it would seem that Jonathan was resolved to undertake the whole risk himself. "The day," the day fixed by him (Sept. *γίνεται ἡ ἡμέρα*, ^{<010E>}1 Samuel 14:1), approached, and without communicating his project to any one, except the young man, whom, like all the chiefs of that age, he retained as his armor bearer, he sallied forth from Gibeah to attack the garrison of the Philistines stationed on the other side of the steep defile of Michmash (^{<010E>}1 Samuel 14:1). His words are short, but they breathe exactly the ancient and peculiar spirit of the Israelitish warrior: "Come, and let us go over unto the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that Jehovah will work for us; for there is no restraint to Jehovah to save by many or by few." The answer is no less characteristic of the close friendship of the two young men, already like that which afterwards sprang up between Jonathan and David. "Do all that is in thine heart; behold, *I* am with thee as thy heart is my heart (Sept., ^{<010E>}1 Samuel 14:7)." After the manner of the time (and the more, probably, from having taken no counsel of the high priest or any prophet before his departure), Jonathan proposed to draw an omen for their course from the conduct of the enemy. If the garrison, on seeing them, gave intimations of descending upon them, they would remain in the valley; if, on the other hand, they raised a challenge to advance, they were to accept it. The latter turned out to be the case. The first appearance of the two warriors from behind the rocks was taken by the Philistines as a furtive apparition of "the Hebrews coming forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves;" and they were welcomed with a scoffing invitation (such as the Jebusites afterwards offered to David), "Come up, and we will show you a thing" (14:4-12). Jonathan immediately took them at their word. Strong and active as he was, "strong as a lion, and swift as an eagle" (^{<10E3>}2 Samuel 1:23), he was fully equal to the adventure of climbing on his hands and feet up the face of the cliff. When he came directly in view of them, with his armor bearer behind him, they both, after the manner of their tribe (^{<13E1>}1 Chronicles 12:2), discharged a flight of arrows, stones, and pebbles from their bows, crossbows, and slings, with such effect that twenty men fell at the first onset. A panic seized the garrison, thence spread to the camp, and thence to the surrounding hordes of marauders; an earthquake combined with the terror of the moment; the confusion increased; the Israelites who had been taken slaves by the Philistines during the last three days (Sept.) rose in mutiny; the Israelites who lay hid in the numerous caverns and deep holes in which the rocks of the neighborhood abound, sprang out of their subterranean dwellings. Saul and his little band had watched in

astonishment the wild retreat from the heights of Gibeah; he now joined in the pursuit, which led him headlong after the fugitives, over the rugged plateau of Bethel, and down the pass of Beth-horon to Ajalon (^{<0945>}1 Samuel 14:15-31). *SEE GIBEAH*. The father and son had not met on that day: Saul only conjectured his son's absence from not finding him when he numbered the people. Jonathan had not heard of the rash curse (14:24) which Saul invoked on any one who ate before the evening. In the dizziness and darkness (Hebrew, ^{<0947>}1 Samuel 14:27) that came on after his desperate exertions, he put forth the staff which apparently had (with his sling and bow) been his chief weapon, and tasted the honey which lay on the ground as they passed through the forest. The pursuers in general were restrained even from this slight indulgence by fear of the royal curse; but the moment that the day, with its enforced fast, was over, they flew, like Muslims at sunset during the fast of Ramadan, on the captured cattle, and devoured them, even to the brutal neglect of the law which forbade the dismemberment of the fresh carcasses with the blood. This violation of the law Saul endeavored to prevent and to expiate by erecting a large stone, which served both as a rude table and as an altar; the first altar that was raised under the monarchy. It was in the dead of night, after this wild revel was over, that he proposed that the pursuit should be continued till dawn; 'and then; when the silence of the oracle of the high priest indicated that something had occurred to intercept the divine favor, the lot was tried, and Jonathan appeared as the culprit. Jephthah's dreadful sacrifice would have been repeated; but the people interposed in behalf of the hero of that great day, and Jonathan was saved (^{<0942>}1 Samuel 14:24-46).

2. But the chief interest of Jonathan's career is derived from the friendship with David, which began on the day of David's return from the victory over the champion of Gath, and continued till his death. It is the first Biblical instance of a romantic friendship, such as was common afterwards in Greece, and has been since in Christendom; and is remarkable both as giving its sanction to these, and as filled with a pathos of its own, which has been imitated, but never surpassed, in modern works of fiction. "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul" — "Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women" (^{<0981>}1 Samuel 18:1 ^{<1025>}2 Samuel 1:26). Each found in each the affection that he found not in his own family; no jealousy of rivalry between the two, as claimants for the same throne, ever interposed: "Thou shalt be king in Israel, and I shall be next unto thee" (^{<0927>}1 Samuel 23:17).

The friendship was confirmed, after the manner of the time, by a solemn compact often repeated. The first was immediately on their first acquaintance. Jonathan gave David as a pledge his royal mantle, his sword, his girdle, and his famous bow (^{<0180>}1 Samuel 18:4). His fidelity was soon called into action by the insane rage of his father against David. He interceded for his life, at first with success (^{<0900>}1 Samuel 19:1-7). Then the madness returned, and David fled. It was in a secret interview during this flight, by the stone of Ezel, that the second covenant was made between the two friends, of a still more binding kind, extending to their mutual posterity — Jonathan laying such emphasis on this portion of the compact as almost to suggest the belief of a slight misgiving on his part of David's future conduct in this respect. It is this interview which brings out the character of Jonathan in the liveliest colors — his little artifices — his love for both his father and his friend — his bitter disappointment at his father's unmanageable fury — his familiar sport of archery. With passionate embraces and tears the two friends parted, B.C. cir. 1062, to meet only once more (^{<0900>}1 Samuel 20). That one more meeting was far away in the forest of Ziph, during Saul's pursuit of David. Jonathan's alarm for his friend's life is now changed into a confidence that he will escape: "He strengthened his hand in God." Finally, and for the third time, they renewed the covenant, and then parted forever (^{<0236>}1 Samuel 23:16-18). B.C. cir. 1061.

From this time forth we hear no more till the battle of Gilboa. In that battle he fell, with his two brothers and his father, and his corpse shared their fate (^{<0800>}1 Samuel 31:2, 8). B.C. 1053. His remains were buried first at Jabesh-Gilead (ib. 13), but afterwards removed with those of his father to Zelah in Benjamin (^{<0212>}2 Samuel 21:12). The news of his death occasioned the celebrated elegy of David, in which, as the friend, he naturally occupies the chief place (^{<0012>}2 Samuel 1:22, 23, 25, 26), and which seems to have been sung in the education of the archers of Judah, in commemoration of the one great archer, Jonathan: "He bade them teach the children of Judah the use of the bow" (^{<0017>}2 Samuel 1:17, 18).

Jonathan left one son, aged five years old at the time of his death (^{<0004>}2 Samuel 4:4), to whom he had probably given his original name of Merib-baal, afterwards changed for Mephibosheth (comp. ^{<0384>}1 Chronicles 8:34; 9:40). *SEE MEPHIBOSHETH*. Through him the line of descendants was continued down to the time of Ezra (^{<0394>}1 Chronicles 9:40), and even then their great ancestor's archery was practiced among them. *SEE DAVLD*.

See Niemeyer, *Charakter*. 4, 413; Herder, *Geist. der Hebr. Poesie*, 2, 287; Koster, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, 2, 366; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 2, 530; Pareau, *Elegia Davidis*, etc. (Groning. 1829); Simon, *De amicitia Davidii et Jonah* (Hildburgh. 1739).

IV. Son of Shage, a relative of Ahiam, both among David's famous warriors and descendants of Jashen of the mountains of Judah (^{<1033>}2 Samuel 23:32; ^{<3134>}1 Chronicles 11:34). B.C. 1046. *SEE HARARITE.*

V. Son of the high priest Abiathar, and one of the adherents to David's cause during the rebellion of Absalom (^{<1057>}2 Samuel 15:27, 36). He remained at En-rogel under pretence of procuring water, and reported to his master the proceedings in the camp of the insurgents (^{<1073>}2 Samuel 17:20; Josephus **Ἰωνάθης**, *Ant.* 7, 9, 2). B.C. cir. 1023. At a later date his constancy was manifested on a similar occasion by announcing to the ambitious Adonijah the forestallment of his measures by the succession of Solomon (1 Kings 1, 42, 43). B.C. cir. 1015. "On both occasions it may be remarked that he appears as the swift and trusty messenger. He is the last descendant of Eli of whom we hear anything" (Smith). *SEE DAVID.*

VI. Son of Shammah (Shimeah or Shimea), and David's nephew, as well as one of his chief warriors, a position which he earned by slaying a gigantic relative of Goliath (^{<1022>}2 Samuel 21:21; ^{<1310>}1 Chronicles 20:7; Josephus **Ἰωνάθης**, *Ant.* 7, 12, 2). B.C. 1018. He was also made secretary of the royal cabinet (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 27:32, where **dwD** is mistaken in the Auth. Vers. for the usual sense of "uncle"). B.C. 1014. "Jerome (*Quest. Hebr.* on ^{<0972>}1 Samuel 17:12) conjectures that this was Nathan the prophet, thus making up the eighth son, not named in ^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 2:13-15. But this is not probable" (Smith).

VII. Son of Uzziah, and steward of the agricultural revenue of David (1 Chronicles 27:25; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").

VIII. One of the Levites sent by Jehoshaphat to aid in teaching the Law to the people (^{<1378>}1 Chronicles 17:8; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").

IX. A scribe whose house was converted into a prison in which Jeremiah was closely confined (^{<2475>}Jeremiah 27:15, 20; 38:26). B.C. 589.

- X.** Brother of Johanan, the son of Kareah, and associated with him in his intercourse with Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor of Jerusalem (^{<2418>}Jeremiah 40:8). B.C. 587.
- XI.** Son of Shemaiah and priest contemporary with Joiakim (^{<1628>}Nehemiah 12:18; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").
- XII.** Son of Melicu and priest contemporary with Joiakim. (^{<1624>}Nehemiah 12:14). B.C. between 536 and 459.
- XIII.** Father of Ebed, which latter was an Israelite of the "sons" of Adin that returned from Babylon with Ezra (^{<1816>}Ezra 8:6) at the head of fifty males, a number which is increased to 250 in 1 Esdr. 8:32, where Jonathan is written Ἰωνάθας. B.C. ante 459.
- XIV.** Son of Asahel, a chief Israelite associated with Jahaziah in separating the returned exiles from their Gentile wives (^{<1505>}Ezra 10:15). B.C. 459.
- XV.** Son of Joiada and father of Jaddua, Jewish high priests (^{<1621>}Nehemiah 12:11); elsewhere called JOHANAN (^{<1622>}Nehemiah 12:22), and apparently *John* by Josephus, who relates his assassination of his own brother Jesus in the Temple (*Ant.* 11, 7, 1 and 2). Jonathan, or John, was high priest for thirty-two years, according to Eusebius and the Alexandr. Chronicles (Selden, *De Success. in Pontif.* cap. 6, 7). *SEE HIGH PRIEST.*
- XVI.** Son of Shemaiah, of the family of Asaph, and father of Zechariah, which last was one of the priests appointed to flourish the trumpets as the procession moved around the rebuilt walls of Jerusalem (^{<1625>}Nehemiah 12:35). B.C. ante 446.
- XVII.** A son of Mattathias, and leader of the Jews in their war of independence after the death of his brother Judas Maccabaeus, B.C. 161 (1 Macc. 9:19 sq.). — Smith. *SEE MACCABEES.*
- XVIII.** A son of Absalom (1 Macc. 13:11), sent by Simon with a force to occupy Joppa, which was already in the hands of the Jews (1 Macc. 12:33), though probably held only by a weak garrison. Jonathan expelled the inhabitants (τοὺς ὄντας ἐν αὐτῇ); comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 6, 3) and secured the city. Jonathan was probably a brother of Mattathias (2) (1 Macc. 11:70).

XIX. A priest who is said to have offered up a solemn prayer on the occasion of the sacrifice made by Nehemiah after the recovery of the sacred fire (2 Macc. 1, 23 sq.; compare Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* 4, 184 sq.). The narrative is interesting, as it presents a singular example of the combination of Public prayer with sacrifice (Grimm, ad 2 *Macc.* 1.c.).

XX. A Sadducee at whose instigation Hyrcanus (q.v.) abandoned the Pharisees for their mild sentence against his maligner Eleazar (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 10, 6).

XXI. Son of Ananus, appointed Jewish high priest, A.D. 36, by Vitellius in place of Joseph Caiaphas (*Ant.* 18, 4, 2), and deposed after two years, when his brother Theophilus succeeded him (*ib.* 5, 2). He was reappointed by Agrippa A.D. 43, but this time he declined that honor in favor of his brother Matthias (Josephus, *Ant.* 19, 6, 4); he was sent by Cumanus to Claudius in a quarrel with the Samaritans, but appears to have been released by the emperor (*War.* 2, 12, 6 and 7); he was at last murdered by the Sicarii (*War.* 2, 13, 3). He was perhaps the high priest whom Felix caused to be assassinated for his reproofs of his bad government (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 8, 5). (See Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 1, 589; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 3, 263, 287, 357.) **SEE HIGH PRIEST.**

XXII. A common weaver, leader of the Sicarii in Cyrene, captured and put to death by the Romans after various adventures (Josephus, *War.* 7, 11, 12).

XXIII. A Jew who challenged the Romans to single combat during the last siege, and, after slaying one combatant, Pudens, was at length killed by Priscus (Josephus, *War.* 6, 2, 10).

Jonathan ben-Anan.

SEE JONATHAN, 21.

Jonathan ben-Uzziel,

the celebrated translator of the Hebrew prophetic writings into Chaldee, a disciple of Hillel I, one of the first of those thirty disciples of Hillel who, in the language of the Talmud, "were worthy to possess the power of stopping the sun like Joshua," flourished about B.C. 30. His expositions were especially on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, a fanciful reason for

which is given in the Talmud: "When the illuminating sun arose upon the dark passages of the prophets, through this translation, the length and breadth of Palestine were agitated, and everywhere the voice of God (**tb l wq**) or the voice of the people (*vox populi vox dei*) was heard asking, 'Who has disclosed these mysteries to the sons of men?' With great humility and becoming modesty Jonathan b.-Uzziel answered, 'I have disclosed the mysteries; but thou, O Lord, knowest that I have not done it to get glory for myself, or for the house of my father, but for thy glory's sake, that discussion might not increase in Israel'" (*Megilla*, 3, a). From these notices in the Talmud, it is manifest that Jonathan was only the Chaldee translator of the prophets; for it is distinctly declared in the last quoted passage that when Jonathan wished also to translate the Hagiographa (**µybwtk**), the same voice from heaven (**l wq tb**) emphatically forbade it (**ˆyyd**), because of the great Messianic mysteries contained therein (**tyad j yçm /q hyb**), especially in the book of Daniel (comp. Rashi in loco). But tradition has also ascribed to him the paraphrase of the Pentateuch known under the name of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Targum of the five Megilloth.

The question of the authorship of the paraphrases will be treated in full in the article TARGUM *SEE TARGUM* (q.v.). We have room here only for a few points in the discussion, and will mainly speak of the work which is generally fastened upon him. Firstly, then, as to this *Paraphrase on the Prophets* (**µynçar µyaybn µygrt µynwrj aw**), which embraces Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, its importance is not only great because it contains expositions of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, but mainly so because, dating, as it does, from a period when the Hebrew language gave place to the Aramaic dialect, and when ancient Jewish traditions and scriptural expositions were introduced in the paraphrases read during the divine services of the Jewish people, it contains very many ancient readings, which go far to explain many an obscure passage in the prophetic writings, and thus prevent false criticism and loose conjecture. A list of these various readings has been collected in the Hebrew annual entitled **/wl j h** (Lemburg, 1852), 1, 109 sq. The paraphrase was first published in 1494, and afterwards with that of Onkelos on the Pentateuch (Venice). It is found in all the Rabbinic Bibles; also in Walton's *Biblia Polygl.* (2, 3, and 4), and in Buxtorf's *Biblia Hebroea* (Basle, 1720, 2-4), etc., with a Latin translation.

As to the other reputed writings of Jonathan, we have

(a) the *Paraphrase on the Pentateuch* (תנ"ך פארגרט הר"מ ל []; it is nothing more or less than a completed version of what is called the Jerusalem or Palestine Targum (רמל פארגרט פארגרט), which of itself is in reality only desultory glosses on Onkelos's paraphrase. This completed version was at first called Targum Jerusalem, after the fragment on which it was based, but afterwards it obtained the name of Targum Jonathan, by erroneously resolving the abbreviation $y\delta t = \mu w g r t \ y m l \ \phi w r y$ into $\hat{t} n w h y \ \mu y g r t$. The additions to the work were probably not made prior to the seventh century. The work was first published in Venice 1590-91, with the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, the paraphrase of Onkelos, the fragments of the Jerusalem glosses, the commentaries of Rashi and Jacob ben-Asher, then in Basle (1607), Hanau (1614), Amsterdam (1640), Prague (1646), etc., and has lately been printed, with a commentary, in the beautiful edition of the Pentateuch with the Rabbinic commentaries (Vienna, 1859). Explanations of it were also written by David b.-Jacob (Prague, 1609), Feiwei b.-David Secharja (Hanau, 1614), Mordecai Kremsier (Amsterdam, 1671); and it was translated into Latin by Chevallier, in Walton's *Polyglot*. An English translation was published by the late learned Wesleyan preacher, J.W. Etheridge (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); but the masterly treatises on this Pseudo-Jonathan are by Seligsohn and Traub, and by Frankel, *Zeitschr. f. d. relig. Int. d. Judenth.* (1846), p. 100 sq. (comp. Seligsohn and Traub, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, Lpz. 1856, 6, 96-114, 138-149; Etheridge, *Introd. to Jewish Lit.* p. 195; Wiener, *De Jonathanis in Pent. paraphrasi Chaldaica*; Petermann, *De duabus Pent. paraphrasibus Chaldaicis*): —

(b) the *Paraphrase on the Five Megilloth*. Some early critics have attributed this work to Mar Josef, of Sora (died 332), but of late it is assigned to a later period even than the paraphrase of the Pentateuch, and is considered simply a compilation from ancient materials made by several individuals. This version is generally published, together with the Hebrew text, in the Jewish editions of the Pentateuch, and is contained in all the Rabbinic Bibles. A rhymed version of the whole of this paraphrase was published by Jacob ben-Samuel, also called Koppelmann ben-Bonem (about 1584). A Latin version of it is given in Walton's *Polyglot*. Gill has given an English translation of the entire paraphrase on the Song of Songs (*Comment. on the Song*, 1728); and Dr. Ginsburg has lately translated the first chapter of the paraphrase of the Song (*Comment. on the Song*, p. 29 sq.), and the whole of Ecclesiastes (*Comment. on Eccles.* p. 503 sq.).

Hebrew commentaries on this paraphrase have been written by Mordecai Lorca (Cracow, 1580) and Chajim Feiwel (Berlin, 1705). See also Bartolucci, *Biblioth. Magna Rabbinica*, 3, 788 sp.; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebroea*, 2, 1159 sp.; Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstl. Vorträge d. Juden*, p. 62 sq.; Geiger *Urschrift u. Uebersetzungen d. Bibel*; Jost, *Geschichte d. Juden*, 1, 269; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 2, 105, 107; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Lit.* 2, s.v.

Jon'athas

(Ἰωνάθαν v.r. Ἰαθάβ; Vulg. *Jonathus* v.r. *Nathan*), the Latin form of the common name Jonathan, which is preserved in the A.V. at Tob. 5, 13.

Jo'nath-e'lem-recho'kim

((μυγϳ̄σ̄μ| aetn'ly, *yonath' e'lem rechokim'*, *dove of the dumbness of the distances*, i.e. the silent dove in distant places, or among strangers; Septuag. ὑπέρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγίων μεμακρυμμένου, *Vulg. pro populo qui a Sanctis longe factus est*), an enigmatical title of ^{<1560>}Psalm 56, variously interpreted, but probably descriptive of David's solitary feelings while absent from the worship of the Temple among the Philistines; comp. ^{<1583>}Psalm 38:13; 65:5; 74:19. (See Alexander, *Comment. ad loc.*) The expression "upon" (| []), preceding this phrase, would seem to indicate that it was the name or opening clause of some well known air to which the ode was set, a supposition not inconsistent with the above appropriation. Its original application would in that case be unknown, like that of similar superscriptions of other Psalms. "Rashi considers that David employed the phrase to describe his own unhappy condition when, exiled from the land of Israel, he was living with Achish, and was an object of suspicion and hatred to the countrymen of Goliath: thus was he amongst the Philistines as a mute (tyml a) dove. Kimchi supplies the following commentary: 'The Philistines sought to seize and slay David (^{<1520>}1 Samuel 29:4-11), and he, in his terror, and pretending to have lost his reason, called himself *Jonath*, even as a dove driven from her cote.' Knapp's explanation 'on the oppression of foreign rulers' assigning to *Elem* the same meaning which it has in ^{<1255>}Exodus 15:15 is in harmony with the contents of the psalm, and is worthy of consideration. De Wette translates 'dove of the distant terebinths,' or 'of the dove of dumbness (Stummheit) among the strangers' or 'in distant places.' According to the Septuagint, the phrase means 'on the people far removed from the holy places' (probably, | a

=,l Wa, the Temple hall; see *Orient. Literaturblatt*. p. 579, year 1841), a rendering which very nearly accords with the Chaldee paraphrase: 'On the congregation of Israel, compared with a mute dove while exiled from their cities, but who come back again and offer praise to the Lord of the Universe.' Aben-Ezra regards *Jonath-elem-rechokim* as merely indicating the modulation or the rhythm of the psalm. In the notes to Mendelssohn's version of the Psalms, *Jonath-elem-rechokim* is mentioned as a musical instrument which produced dull, mournful sounds. 'Some take it for a pipe called in Greek ἔλυμος, *tnwy*, from [^]wy, *Greek*, which would make the inscription read "the long Grecian pipe," but this does not appear to us admissible' (*Preface*, p. 26)" *SEE PSALMS*.

Joncourt, Peter De

a French Protestant theologian, was born at Clermont towards the middle of the 17th century. A few years before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes he removed to Holland, and became pastor of Middelburg in 1678, and of La Haye in 1699. He died in the latter city in 1725. He was considered one of the best preachers of his day. He wrote *Entretiens sur les différentes Methodes d'expliquer l'Ecriture et de precher de ceux qu'on appelle Cocceiens et Voetiens*, etc. (Amst. 1707, 12mo): — *Nouveaux entretiens*, etc. (Amst. 1708, 12mo); quite a controversy resulted from this work, but Joncourt was ordered by the synod of Nimeguen to desist from his attacks, and to retract, which he did in the *Lettre aux eglises Wallonnes des Pays-Bas* (La Haye, 1708, 12mo): — *Pensees utiles aux Chretiens de tous les etats*, etc. (La Haye, 1710, 8vo): — *Lettres sur les Jeux de Hasard et sur l'usage de se faire celer pour eviter une visite incommode* (La Haye, 1713, 12mo), mostly against La Placette's *Divers Traites sur des matieres de conscience* (Amst. 1708, 12mo), and a work which gave rise to several pamphlets on this question: — *Lettres critiques sur divers sujets importants de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Amst. 1715, 12mo): — *Entretiens sur l'etat present de la Religion en France* (La Haye, 1725, 12mo). He also published a revised edition of Clement Marot and Th. de Beza's translation of the Psalms (Amsterd. 1716, 12mo). See J.G. Walch, *Biblioth. Theologica selecta*, vol. 2; *Journal des Savants*, June, 1714, p. 579; January, 1715, p. 85; February, p. 123; Querard, *La France Litteraire*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 26, 901. (J.N.P.)

Jones, Benjamin (1)

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in South Carolina about 1774; entered the itinerancy in 1801; was stationed at Charleston in 1802; and died suddenly on Bladen Circuit in 1804. He was a man of much seriousness and Christian gentleness, and a very useful *preacher*. — *Conf. Minutes*, 1, 125. (G.L.T.)

Jones, Benjamin (2),

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Sandwich, Mass., July 28, 1786; united with the Church in 1805; entered the New York Conference in 1809; was made presiding elder in 1820; was delegate to the General Conference in 1832 and in 1840; was by poor health superannuated in 1846; and died at Lincolnville, Me., July 18, 1850, aged 64. Mr. Jones was a man of more than ordinary ability and influence. His preaching was bold, sustained, and independent; dealing in truthful logic and the word of God rather than fancy, and very strong in argument. His efforts were often eloquent in the highest degree. — *Conf. Min.* 4, 606; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, chap. 42. (G.L.T.)

Jones, Charles Colcock, D.D.,

a Presbyterian divine, was born at Liberty Hall, Ga., Dec. 20, 1804. While yet a youth he entered a large counting house in Savannah, Ga., but when converted, in his 18th year, he decided to quit mercantile life and enter the ministry. He prepared for college at Phillips Academy, then entered Andover Seminary, and later the theological seminary at Princeton. He was licensed in 1830 by the New Brunswick Presbytery at Allentown, New Jersey, and returned to Georgia in the autumn, and shortly afterwards became missionary to the negroes of Liberty County, Ga. He soon became interested in the colored race, and during the remainder of his life sought by extensive correspondence, by his annual reports as a missionary, and by all other means in his power, to engage the attention of the Christian public to the moral condition of this class of our population. In 1835 he was elected professor of Church history and polity in the seminary at Columbia, and after having been earnestly urged to accept the chair, on the plea that he might even there continue to work for the colored people, by inciting the students to engage with him in the work, he accepted the position in 1836. But he felt restless in his new place, and in 1838 returned again to his former work. In 1847 he was reelected to the professorship, and again

prevailed upon to accept the proffered honor; he now continued in the seminary until its close in 1850. At the same time he filled the position of secretary to the Board of Missions for the South and Southwest. In 1850 he removed to Philadelphia, to assume the duties of secretary of the Assembly's Board of Domestic Missions, and this position he filled until Oct. 1853, when failing health necessitated his return to Georgia. During the Rebellion he attached himself to the Southern cause. But his health was too feeble to permit much exertion, for he suffered from consumption. He died March 16, 1863. "Dr. Jones filled a large place in the esteem and affections of the Church of God. As a man there was decision and energy of character, united with great friendliness of heart, cheerfulness of disposition, activity of mind, and ease and polish of manners. Few equaled him in all that makes up the ease and polish of the Christian gentleman. As a preacher there was much that was attractive in his appearance and manner. A delightful simplicity, ease, and unction pervaded his happiest efforts." Dr. Jones published a *Catechism of Scripture Doctr. and Practice: — Catechism on the Creed: — Hist. Catechism of the O.T. and N.T.*; besides several pamphlets on the *Religious Instr. of the Negro*. His *Catechism of Script. Doctrine and Practice* was extensively used, and was found so serviceable to missionaries generally that it was translated into several languages, and was made a manual for the instruction of the heathen. He also began a *History of the Church of God*, which he did not live to complete (it was published by Scribner). See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 438. (J.H.W.)

Jones, Cornelius,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hinsdale, Mass., May 20, 1800; was converted in Geauga Co., Ohio, Feb. 1821; entered the Pittsburgh Conference in 1827; and died at Alleghanytown, Aug. 27, 1835. He was a diligent student, an able minister, and a successful evangelist. — *Conference Minutes*, 2, 483.

Jones, David (1),

a Baptist minister, was born in White Clay Creek Hundred, Newcastle Co., Del., May 12, 1736. In 1758 he was converted, and soon after determined to improve his education, which had been somewhat neglected. He entered Hopewell School, and remained there three years, eagerly pursuing the study of the classic languages. In 1761 he became a licentiate, and was

regularly ordained pastor in 1767 to the church at Freehold, Monmouth Co., New Jersey. In 1772 he removed to enter upon the missionary work among the Indians in Ohio. But he failed so utterly in these efforts that after the lapse of two years he returned again to his former charge. In the Revolutionary War he served as chaplain, and only resumed the regular work of the ministry at the close of the war. In 1786 he became pastor at Southampton, Pa. In 1794 he again entered the army, this time at the special request of general Wayne. He also served as chaplain during the War of 1812. He died in Chester Co., Pa., Feb. 5, 1820. See Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit*, 6, 85 sq.

Jones, David (2),

another Baptist minister, was born in the north of Wales in April, 1785. He united with the Independent Church when about fifteen years old. Shortly after he emigrated to this country, and lived in Ohio. After a stay of two years among the Baptists, who were thickly settled in that immediate vicinity, he joined their Church, and was licensed to preach. He accepted a call to the Beaver Creek Baptist Church, teaching at the same time. From 1810 to 1813 he had no settled charge, and he traveled through several of the middle and border states, preaching from place to place. In 1813 he went to Newark, New Jersey, as pastor from which, in 1821, he was called to assume the pastorate of the Baptist Church at "Lower Dublin," near Philadelphia, where he had preached occasionally before his departure for Newark. With this people he spent the remainder of his life. He died April 9, 1833. He was (in part) the author of a tract on Baptism, entitled *Letters of David and John*, and wrote also the tract *Salvation by Grace*, published by the Baptist General Tract Society. See Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit*, 6, 518 sq.

Jones, Greenbury R.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Brownsville, Pa., April 7, 1784; was converted in August, 1803; entered the itinerancy at Steubenville, Ohio, in 1818; was presiding elder on Scioto District in 1821; Miami District in 1827; Portland District in 1832; but superannuated in that year, and so remained until 1839; and died at Marietta Conference Sept. 20, 1844. Mr. Jones was a zealous and capable minister, of fine tact and sound judgment. He was several times secretary of the Ohio Conference, nine years presiding elder, and twice delegate to the General Conference.

He was faithful in all things. and much beloved. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 3, 651; Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit*, 7, 587. (G.L.T.)

Jones, Griffith

a Welsh divine, generally known as the Welsh Apostle, was born at Kilreddis, Caermarthenshire, in 1684. His parents, who were eminently pious, took great pains to imbue the mind of their son from his earliest years with impressions of religion. The serious turn which they thus gave to his mind inclined him towards the Christian ministry. At the completion of his theological studies he was ordained by bishop Bull, Sept. 19, 1708, and shortly after appointed to the rectory of Llanddowror by Sir John Philips, whose own religious character made him anxious to secure the services of a man of piety and learning like Jones. "In this situation," says Middleton (*Evangelical Biography*, s.v.), "he soon developed all the best qualities of a man of God, and a most eloquent and evangelical preacher. Christ was all to him; and it was his greatest delight to publish and exalt the unsearchable riches of his Redeemer's righteousness. Nor was he less blessed in his private plans of doing good. He founded among his countrymen free schools, and by this means more than a hundred and fifty thousand poor people were taught to read. He also circulated thirty thousand copies of the Welsh Bible among them, besides other religious and useful books. His humility gave luster to all these labors of love. On his dying bed he said, 'I must bear witness to the goodness of God to me. Blessed be God, his comforts fill my soul.' He died in April, 1761. It may be truly said of Griffith Jones that few lives were more heavenly and useful, and few deaths more triumphant." Jones also wrote and published several religious treatises in Welsh and English, of which many thousands were distributed as had been the Bible. See Jamieson, *Cyclop. Relig. Biog.* p. 289; Alibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Jones, Horatio Gates

(son of David Jones, 1), also a Baptist minister, was born at Easttown, Chester County, Pa., Feb. 11, 1777. His early education was quite thorough, and remarkably so for a young man destined for agricultural life. Gifted with great fluency of speech, young Jones became "the politician" of his own immediate vicinity, and before he had reached his majority enjoyed the prospect of preferment in political life. Just about this time he became conscious, however, of his responsibility to his Maker, and, believing

himself to have been the subject of spiritual renovation, he made public declaration of his belief, June 24, 1798, and determined to devote his life to the Christian ministry. He was licensed Sept. 26, 1801, and called to Salem, New Jersey, Feb. 13, 1802. In 1805 his health became enfeebled, and he was obliged to resign, however reluctantly, the charge. Hereafter he devoted himself to farm life on a place which he bought on the banks of the Schuylkill River, about five miles above Philadelphia. But Jones had engaged too heartily in the cause of his Master not to be tempted to reenter the work of the Christian ministry whenever his health should warrant the task. At first he went to different places from time to time and preached; finally he made "Thomson's Meeting house" at Lower Merion, Montgomery County, belonging to the Presbyterians, his headquarters, and he succeeded, after several years of ardent labor, in building up there a Baptist Church, which he served until the end of his earthly days, Dec. 12, 1853. Mr. Jones held a prominent position in the board of trustees of the University of Lewisburg, Pa., and was at one time its chancellor. This high school conferred on him the degree of D.D. The degree of M.A. he received from Brown University in 1812. He was also a member of the Baptist Board of Missions, and was at one time (1829) president of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, of which society he published a *History* in 1823, and held a coeditorship of the *Latter-day Luminary*, an early Baptist missionary magazine. Indeed, we are told that "few men of his day have written so much and so well, and published so little." See Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit*, 6, 452 sq.

Jones, Jeremiah

a learned English dissenting minister, was born, as is supposed, of parents in opulent circumstances, in the north of England, in 1693. After finishing his education under the Rev. Samuel Jones, of Tewksbury, who was also the tutor of Chandler, Butler, Seeker, and many other distinguished divines, he became minister of a congregation at Forest Green, in Glouoetershire, where he also kept an academy. He died in 1734. His works are as follows: *A Vindication of the former Part of the Gospel by Matthew from Mr. Whiston's Charge of Dislocation*, etc. (London, 1719, 8vo; Salop, 1721, 8vo, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1803): — also, *A new and full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament* (London, 1726, 2 vols. 8vo; vol. 3, 1727, 8vo; Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1798, 3 vols. 8vo, and since). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* (London);

Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 23; *Monthly Magazine*, April 1803; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, 2, 988.

Jones, Joel

a celebrated lay writer on theological subjects, and jurist by profession, was born of Puritan ancestry at Coventry, Conn., Oct. 26, 1795, and educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1817. He was one of the judges of the Philadelphia District Court, and later mayor of Philadelphia. In 1848 he was elected president of Girard College, and he held that position for two years. He died Feb. 3, 1860. Distinguished for his great legal abilities, judge Jones deserves a place in our work on account of his extended researches in the Biblical department. His acquirements extended far beyond the widest range of professional attainment. Judge Jones wrote extensively for literary journals and quarterlies; he also published largely. Of special interest to the theological student are, *Story of Joseph, or Patriarchal Age* (originally published for the use of Girard College students): — *The Knowledge of One Another in the Future State: — Notes on Scripture* (published by his widow, Phila. 1860). He also edited several English works on Prophecy, which he published under the title of *Literalist* (5 vols. 8vo), enriched with many valuable additions of his own, and translated from the French, *Outlines of a History of the Court of Rome and of the Temporal Power of the Popes* (to which he appended many original notes). Judge Jones was a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, and held positions in various ecclesiastical boards, where his services were greatly prized. See *Princeton Review*, Index, 2, 219 sq.

Jones, John (1)

an English Roman Catholic theologian, was born at London in 1575. He studied at St. John's College, Oxford, where he roomed with Laud, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. Having turned Roman Catholic, he went to Spain, completed his studies at the University of Compostello, and became a Benedictine under the name of *Leander a Sancto-Martino*. After teaching for a while Hebrew and theology in the College of St. Vedast, he returned to England at the invitation of Laud, and died at London, Dec. 17, 1636. He wrote *Sacra Alrs Memorioe, ad Scripturas divinas in promptu habendas accomodata* (Douay, 1623, 8vo): — *Conciliatio locorum communium totius Scripturoe* (Douay, 1623, 8vo). He also published some editions of the Bible, with interlinear glosses (6 vols. fol.); of the works of

Blosius; of Arnobe, *Adversus Gentes* (Douay, 1634); and worked with P. Reyner on the *Apostolatus Benedictinorum*. See Wood, *Athenes Oxoniensis*, vol. 1; Dodd, *Ch. History*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 26, 905. (J.N.P.)

Jones, John (2)

an English Protestant divine, was born in 1700. He was educated at Worcester College, Oxford, and ordained in 1726. Having become vicar of Aconbury, he resigned in 1751, to take the rectory of Boulne Hurat, Bedfordshire. His death was caused by a fall from his horse; the time of its occurrence is not recorded. He wrote [Anon.] *Free and candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England*, etc. (Lond. 1753, 8vo): this work produced a great controversy, lasting several years: — *Cursory Animadversions upon "Free and Candid Disquisitions,"* etc. (Lond. 1753, 8vo): — *Catholic Faith and Practice* (1765). See Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*; *London Gentl. Magazine*, 81, pt. 1, p. 510 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* 2, s.v.

Jones, John (3), LL.D.,

a Welsh Socinian divine and philological writer, was born in Caermarthenshire, and educated at the Unitarian New College, Hackney. In 1792 Mr. Jones was appointed classical and mathematical teacher in the Welsh Academy, Swansea, which situation he held about three years, and then settled at Plymouth Dock over the Unitarian congregation. In 1797 he became minister of the Unitarian congregation at Halifax in Yorkshire, and about 1800 he removed to London, where he resided during the remainder of his life, chiefly occupied as a classical teacher, and preaching only occasionally. He died January 10, 1827. A few years before his death he received the diploma of LL.D. from the University of Aberdeen. Dr. Jones was the author of several works, some of which are religious, chiefly in support or defense of the evidences of Christianity. Of these the most important are *Illustrations of the Four Gospels, founded on circumstances peculiar to our Lord and the Evangelists* (Lond. 1808, 8vo): — *Ecclesiastical Researches, or Philo and Josephus proved to be historians and apologists of Christ*, etc. (London, 1812 — a sequel, 1813, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Epistle to the Romans analyzed* (1802, 8vo): — *New Version of the Epistles to the Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the general Epistle of James* (1819-20, 12mo): — *New Version of the first*

three Chapters of Genesis (1819, 8vo). He also wrote a number of philological works which are considered valuable. It may not be out of place here to state that Dr. Jones was the first English philologist who taught Greek by the medium of the English instead of the Latin. See *Lond. Gentl. Mag.* April, 1827; *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am.* Auth. 2, S.V.

Jones, John M.

a Methodist Episcopal minister and native of England, was born about 1810. He was educated a Romanist in France, and while young emigrated first to Canada and then to Maryland, where he was a teacher in a Romish institution in St. George's County. He was converted to Protestantism in 1834, and two years after entered the Baltimore Conference, and "for twenty years pursued the ministerial calling, laboring day and night with quenchless zeal to rescue souls from death." He died at South Baltimore Station April 20, 1855. He "was a man of rare excellence and many virtues," of deep piety, and an able and devoted minister. — *Conf. Minutes*, 6, 201. (G.L.T.)

Jones, John Taylor, D.D.

a Baptist missionary, was born at New Ipswich, N.H., July 16, 1802. He graduated at Amherst College in 1825; studied theology at Andover and Newton Seminary; and, having joined the Baptist Church in 1828, was the following year appointed a missionary to Burmah. He arrived at Maulmain, his destined place of labor, in Feb. 1831, and, after having mastered the Taling and Siamese languages, he was chosen to go to the kingdom of Siam, and reached Bangkok in April 1833. After a successful mission, he left Siam in 1839, on account of his children, went to Singapore, and thence on a visit to the United States. After returning to Siam for six years he came home again in 1846, and in the fall of 1847 went away for the last time. He died at Bangkok Sept. 13, 1851. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him a few years before his death. Dr. Jones published three tracts in Siamese, 1834; and a translation of the New Testament in the same language, Oct. 1843. The Rev. William Dean says of Dr. Jones's qualifications for the missionary work, "Take him altogether, I have never seen his equal; and among more than a hundred men I have met among the heathen, I would select Dr. Jones as the model missionary." — *Sprague, Annals Am. Pulpit*, 6, 772.

Jones, Joseph Huntington, D.D.

an able Presbyterian minister, and brother of judge Joel (see above), was born at Coventry, Conn., Aug. 24, 1797, and graduated at Harvard College in 1817. After teaching a short time at Bowdoin College, he decided on the ministry for his life work, and entered Princeton Theological Seminary. His first charge he entered June 1, 1824 at Woodbury, New Jersey. The year following, after a most successful work on the small and feeble charge, he was called to New Brunswick, and was installed the second Wednesday of July, 1825. In 1838 he removed to Philadelphia, to take charge of the Sixth Presbyterian Church in that city, and he continued his relation there for twenty-three years. "Beginning with a church reduced so low that a resuscitation was deemed well nigh impossible, and struggling with difficulties that would have discouraged ordinary men, a manifest blessing crowned his efforts." In 1861, finding that the secretaryship of the committee on the "fund for disabled ministers," etc., which he had filled nearly for seven years in connection with his pastoral duties, was of itself onerous enough in its duties, he resigned his position as pastor, and devoted himself hereafter entirely to this noble cause of providing for those of his brethren who were in need of assistance. He died Dec. 22, 1868, in the midst of his work, "suddenly, as it were with the harness on." In 1843 Lafayette College conferred on him the degree of D.D. Dr. Jones published *Revivals of Religion* (Phila. 1839): — *Effects of Physical Causes on Christian Experience* (1846, and often, 18mo): — *Memoir of the Rev. Ashbel Green, D.D.* (N.Y. 1849, 8vo): — *History of the Revival at New Brunswick in 1837*; and several of his sermons and essays. — *Princeton Reviews*, Index, vol. 2, 222 sq.

Jones, Lot, D.D.

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Brunswick, Maine, Feb. 21, 1797, and was educated at Bowdoin College, Maine, where he graduated in 1821. Joining the Protestant Episcopal Church, he studied for the ministry under bishop Griswold, and was by him ordained deacon January 1823, and priest September 1823. In 1823 he was settled at Marblehead and Marshfield, Mass.; in 1825 at Macon, Ga.; in 1827 at Savannah; in 1828 at Gardiner, Maine; in 1829 at South Leicester, Mass.; and in January 1833, he removed to New York, and took charge of the new mission church of the Epiphany. Here his humility, single hearted devotion to his one great work, and untiring industry, made his ministry

remarkably effective. In 1858 he published his 25th anniversary discourse. During those 25 years he baptized 2501-253 adults and 2248 children, married 759 couples, presented 915 for confirmation, enrolled 1494 as communicants, and attended 1362 funerals. He died in Philadelphia Oct. 12, 1865. His death was the result of accident in falling upon the pavement at St. Luke's Church, where he was in attendance upon the meeting of the Board of Missions. — *Church Review*, Jan. 1866, p. 669.

Jones, Robert C.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Petersburg, Va., Dec. 23, 1808. He graduated at William and Mary's College in 1828, studied law and was ready for practice, when he was converted in 1833, and at once prepared for the ministry. He entered the Virginia Conference in 1836, and died Aug. 2, 1838. Mr. Jones was a man of good abilities, much modesty, and a consistent witness of sanctifying grace. He was a dignified and conscientious minister, and a very successful evangelist. — *Conf. Minutes*, 2, 667.

Jones, Samuel, D.D.

a Baptist minister, was born in Glamorganshire, South Wales, Jan. 14, 1735, and was brought by his parents to this country during his infancy, and was educated in the College of Philadelphia, where he received the degree of M.A. May 18, 1762, and turned his attention to the study of theology. He was ordained in January 1763, and became pastor of the united churches of Pennepek and Southampton. In the same year he, by request, remodeled the draft of the charter of a college in Newport, R.I., which institution afterwards became Brown University. In 1770 he resigned the care of the Southampton Church and devoted himself thereafter to that of Pennepek, afterwards called Lower Dublin. He received the honorary degree of M.A. from the College of Rhode island in 1769, and that of D.D. from the College of Pennsylvania in 1788. While attending faithfully to his ministerial labors, he also devoted much time to teaching, in which he was very successful. He died Feb. 7, 1814. Dr. Jones made several compilations for divers associations in which he filled high offices, and published some occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 6, 104 sq.

Jones, Thomas

an English divine, was born in 1729, and educated at Queen's College, Cambridge. He was chaplain at St. Savior's, Southwark, and is noted for his deep piety and great exertions in behalf of the conversion of the masses at a time when the English pulpit was in that deep lethargy from which Wesley and his coadjutors first earnestly aroused it. Like the Wesleys he met with much opposition in his noble efforts, and "his sweetness of natural temper," says his biographer, "great as it was, would never have supported him under the numberless insults he met with had it not been strengthened, as well as adorned, by a sublimer influence." His health finally gave way under his extraordinary labors, and he died, while yet a young man, in 1761. — Middleton, *Evang. Biog.* 4, 380.

Jones, William, M.A., F.R.S.

of Nayland, as he is generally called, was born at Lowick, in Northamptonshire, July 30, 1726. He was educated at the Charter House and University College, Oxford. He there became a convert to the philosophy of Hutchinson, and, having induced Mr. Home, afterwards bishop of Norwich, to adopt the same system, together they became the principal champions of that philosophy. He was admitted to deacon's orders after having received the degree of B.A., in 1749. In 1751 he was ordained priest by the bishop of Lincoln, and on quitting the university became curate of Finedon, and afterwards of Wadsohoe, both in his native county. In 1764 archbishop Secker presented him to the vicarage of Bethersden, in Kent, and in the next year to the rectory of Pluckley, in the same county. In 1776 he took up his residence at Nayland, in Suffolk, where he held the perpetual curacy; and soon after he exchanged his living of Pluckley for the rectory of Paston, in Northamptonshire. In 1780 he became fellow of the Royal Society of London. During many years he was engaged in the composition of a treatise on philosophy, which was intended to elucidate his favorite system. In that work he displayed great learning and ingenuity, as well as ardent attachment to the interests of piety and virtue, united with the eccentric peculiarities of the Hutchinsonian school. Alarmed at the progress of radical and revolutionary opinions during the French Revolution, he employed his pen in opposition to the advocates of such destructive principles, and his writings were widely circulated by the friends of the British government. He treated with equal success questions of theology, morals, literature, philosophy, and, in

addition to all these, showed great talents in musical composition. "He was a man of quick penetration," says bishop Horsley, "of extensive learning, and the soundest piety, and he had the talent of writing upon the deepest subjects for the plainest understanding." In the year 1792 he met with a severe loss in the death of his most intimate friend, bishop Home, to whom he was chaplain. Being now of advanced age, and obliged, by his growing infirmities, to discontinue his practice of taking pupils, that he might not be subjected to inconvenience from the diminution of his income, in the year 1798 the archbishop of Canterbury presented him to the sinecure rectory of Hollingbourn in Kent, which, however, he did not live long to enjoy, dying Feb. 6, 1800, in consequence of a paralytic stroke. His most important works are, *A full Answer to Bp. Clayton's Essay on Spirit* (1753, 8vo): *Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity proved from Scripture*:(1757): — *Course of Lectures on the Figurative Language of the Holy Scriptures* (1787, 8vo): — *Sermons* — (1790, 2 vols. 8vo): — *The Scholar armed against the Errors of the Times* (2 vols. 8vo): — *Memoirs of the Life, Studies, and Writings of George Horne* (1795 and 1799, 8vo). The most complete collection of his works is that in 12 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1801). The theological and miscellaneous works were republished separately (London, 1810, 6 vols. 8vo). Two posthumous volumes of sermons were published for the first time in 1830 (London, 8vo). See W. Stevens, *Life of W. Jones* (1801), Aikin, *Gen. Biography*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, 26, 908; Buck; Davenport; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliog.* 2, 1682. (E. de P.)

Jones, Sir William

an eminent poet, scholar, and lawyer, was born in London Sept. 28, 1746, and was sent to Harrow in 1753, where he soon eclipsed all his fellows, particularly in classical knowledge. In 1764 he was entered at University College, Oxford, where he was enabled to gratify that desire for a knowledge of the Oriental languages which had shown itself during the last two years of his residence at Harrow. In 1765 he left Oxford, to become tutor to the eldest son of earl Spencer, with whom he traveled on the Continent. In 1770 he was admitted to the Inner Temple, and the same year he published, at the request of the king of Denmark, a *Life of Nadir Shah*, translated into French from the Persian; in the following year a *Persian Grammar*, republished some years ago, with corrections and additions, by the late professor Lee; and in 1774 his *Commentaries of Asiatic Poetry*, republished by Eichhorn at Leipsic in 1776. In 1776 he was made a commissioner of bankrupts. In 1780 he completed a translation of

seven Arabic poems, known as the *Moallakat*; wrote an essay *On the Legal Mode of Suppressing Riots*, and another, entitled *Essay on the Law of Bailments*, and two or three odes. In March, 1783, Jones obtained a judgeship in the Supreme Court of Judicature in Bengal, and landed at Calcutta in September. He at once set about the acquisition and promulgation of the knowledge of Oriental languages, literature, and customs. He established the Royal Asiatic Society "for investigating the history, antiquities, arts, sciences, and literature of Asia," of which he was the first president. To the volumes of the *Asiatic Researches* Sir William contributed largely. Besides these, he wrote and published a story in verse, called *The Enchanted Fruit, or the Hindu Wife*; and a translation of an ancient Indian drama, called *Sacontala, or the Fatal Ring*. A translation by him of the Ordinances of Menu (q.v.) appeared in 1794. He was busily employed on a digest of the Hindu and Mohammedan laws, when he was attacked with an inflammation of the liver, which terminated fatally April 27, 1794. Sir Wm. Jones was one of the first linguists and Oriental scholars that Great Britain has produced, being more or less acquainted with no less than twenty-eight different languages. His poems are always elegant, often animated, and their versification is mellifluous. His learning was extensive, his legal knowledge was profound, and he was an enlightened and zealous champion of constitutional principles. He was also an earnest Christian. To devotional exercises he was habitually attentive. In addition to the above works, Sir William Jones published a translation of Isaeus; and also translations of two Mohammedan law tracts *On the Law of Inheritance*, and of *Succession to Property of Intestates: — Tales and Fables. by Nizami: — Two Hymns to Pracriti*; and *Extracts from the Vedas*. The East India Company erected a monument to his memory in St. Paul's Cathedral, and a statue in Bengal. A complete edition of his works, in 6 vols. 4to, was published by lady Jones in 1799; and another appeared, in 13 vols. 8vo, in 1807, with a life of the author by lord Teignmouth.

Jonsson, Finn

(known also by the Latin name of *Finnus Johannoeus*), the historian of the Icelandic Church and literature, was born on the 16th of January, 1704, at Hitardal, in Iceland, where his father, Jon Haldorsson, was minister. He was educated at the School of Skalholt, and in 1725 passed to the University of Copenhagen. On his return to Iceland his intention was to become a lawyer, but the death of his uncle, a parish priest, who left behind him a numerous family of small children, led his father to request him to

alter his views to the Church, that he might bring up the orphans. He obtained the vacant benefice, brought up the family, married, and in 1754 was appointed to the bishopric of Skalholt. He was very attentive to the revenues of his diocese, and the account of his episcopate by Petursson is chiefly occupied with his disputes with refractory tenants of Church property. He died on the 23d of July, 1789. He composed several works in Latin and Icelandic, especially a *Historia Ecclesiastica Islandioe*, first published with valuable additions by his son Finnson (Copenhagen, 1772-8, 4 vols. 4to), and continued by Petursson down to 1840 (ib. 1841), a valuable and interesting work, embracing the literary as well as ecclesiastical affairs of Iceland. — *English Cyclop.* s.v.

Jop'pa

(Heb. *Yapho'*, /py; ^{<16946>}Joshua 19:46; ^{<4216>}2 Chronicles 2:16; ^{<3008>}Jonah 1:3, or a/py; ^{<15307>}Ezra 3:7; *beauty*; Sept., N.T., and Josephus Ἰόππη, other Greek writers Ἰώππη, Ἰώπη, or Ἰόπη; Vulgate *Joppe*; Auth. Vers. "Japho," except in Jonah; usually "Joppe" in the Apocrypha), a town on the southwest coast of Palestine, the port of Jerusalem in the days of Solomon, as it has been ever since.

1. Legends. — The etymology of the name is variously explained; Rabbinical writers deriving it from *Japhet*, but classical geographers from *Iopa* (Ἰόπη), daughter of Æolus and wife of Cepheus, Andromeda's father, its reputed founder; others interpreting it "the watchtower of joy," and so forth (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 864). The fact is, that, from its being a seaport, it had a profane as well as a sacred history. Pliny, following Mela (*De situ Orb.* 1, 12), says that it was of antediluvian antiquity (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 14); and even Sir John Maundeville, in the 14th century, bears witness — though, it must be confessed, a clumsy one — to that tradition (*Early Travels in P.* p. 142). According to Josephus, it originally belonged to the Phoenicians (*Ant.* 13, 15, 4). Here, writes Strabo, some say Andromeda was exposed to the whale (*Geograph.* 16, p. 759; comp. Müller's *Hist. Groec. Fragm.* 4, 325, and his *Geograph. Groec. Min.* 1, 79), and he appeals to its elevated position in behalf of those who laid the scene there; though, in order to do so consistently, he had already shown that it would be necessary to transport Ethiopia into Phoenicia (Strabo, 1, 43). However, in Pliny's age — and Josephus had just before affirmed the same (*War.* 3, 9, 3) — they still showed the chains by which Andromeda was bound; and not only so, but M. Scaurus the younger, the same that was so

much employed in Judaea by Pompey (*War*, 1, 6, 2 sq.), had the bones of the monster transported to Rome from Joppa, where till then they had been exhibited (Mela, *ibid.*), and displayed them there during his aedileship to the public amongst other prodigies. Nor would they have been uninteresting to the modern geologist, if his report be correct; for they measured forty feet in length, the span of the ribs exceeding that of the Indian elephant, and the thickness of the spine or vertebra being one foot and a half ("sesquipedalis," i.e. in circumference — when Solinus says "semipedalis," he means in diameter, see Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 9, 5 and the note, Delphin ed.). Reland would trace the adventures of Jonah in this legendary guise, *SEE JONAH*; but it is far more probable that it symbolizes the first interchange of commerce between the Greeks, personified in their errant hero Perseus, and the Phoenicians, whose lovely, but till then unexplored clime may be shadowed forth in the fair virgin Andromeda. Perseus in the tale, is said to have plunged his dagger into the right shoulder of the monster. Possibly he may have discovered or improved the harbor, the roar from whose foaming reefs on the north could scarcely have been surpassed by the barkings of Scylla or Charybdis. Even the chains shown there may have been those by which his ship was attached to the shore. Rings used by the Romans for mooring their vessels are still to be seen near Terracina, in the south angle of the ancient port (Murray's *Handbk. for S. Italy*, p. 10, 2d ed.).

2. History. — We find that Japho or Joppa was situated in the portion of Dan (⁽¹⁶⁹⁶⁾Joshua 19:46), on the coast towards the south, and on a hill so high, says Strabo, that people affirmed (but incorrectly) that Jerusalem was visible from its summit. Having a harbor attached to it — though always, as still, a dangerous one — it became the port of Jerusalem, when Jerusalem became metropolis of the kingdom of the house of David; and certainly never did port and metropolis more strikingly resemble each other in difficulty of approach both by sea and land. Hence, except in journeys to and from Jerusalem, it was not much used. Accordingly, after the above incidental notice, the place is not mentioned till the times of Solomon, when, as being almost the only available seaport, Joppa was the place fixed upon for the cedar and pine wood from Mount Lebanon to be *landed* by the servants of Hiram, king of Tyre, thence to be conveyed to Jerusalem by the servants of Solomon for the erection of the first "house of habitation" ever made with hands for the invisible Jehovah. It was by way of Joppa similarly that like materials were conveyed from the same locality, by

permission of Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the second Temple under Zerubbabel (^{<1189>}1 Kings 5:9; ^{<1426>}2 Chronicles 2:16; ^{<1517>}Ezra 3:7). Here Jonah, whenever and wherever he may have lived (^{<1245>}2 Kings 14:25, certainly does not clear up the first of these points), "took ship to flee from the presence of his Maker" (^{<3008>}Jonah 1:3), and accomplished that singular history which our Lord has appropriated as a type of one of the principal scenes in the great drama of his own (^{<1121>}Matthew 12:40).

After the close of O.T. history Joppa rose in importance. The sea was then beginning to be the highway of nations. Greece, Egypt, Persia, and some of the little kingdoms of Asia Minor had their fleets for commerce and war. Until the construction of Caesarea by Herod, Joppa was the only port in Palestine proper at which foreign ships could touch; it was thus not only the shipping capital, but the key of the whole country on the seaboard. During the wars of the Maccabees it was one of the principal strongholds of Palestine (1 Macc. 10:75; 14:5, 34; Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 15, 1). It would seem that Jews then constituted only a minority of the population, and the foreign residents — Greeks, Egyptians, and Syrians — were so rich and powerful, and so aided by the fleets of their own nations, as to be able to rule the city. During this period, therefore, Joppa experienced many vicissitudes. It had sided with Apollonius, and was attacked and captured by Jonathan Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 10:76). It witnessed the meeting between the latter and Ptolemy (*ibid.* 11:6). Simon had his suspicions of its inhabitants, and set a garrison there (*ibid.* 12:34), which he afterwards strengthened considerably (*ibid.* 13:11). But when peace was restored, he reestablished it once more as a haven (*ibid.* 14:5). He likewise rebuilt the fortifications (*ibid.* 5:34). This occupation of Joppa was one of the grounds of complaint urged by Antiochus, son of Demetrius, against Simon; but the latter alleged in excuse the mischief which had been done by its inhabitants to his fellow citizens (*ibid.* 15:30 and 35). It would appear that Judas Maccabaeus had burned their haven some time back for a gross act of barbarity (2 Macc. 12:6). Tribute was subsequently exacted for its possession from Hyrcanus by Antiochus Sidetes. By Pompey it was once more made independent, and comprehended under *Syria* (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 4, 4); but by Caesar it was not only restored to the Jews, but its revenues — whether from land or from export duties — were bestowed upon the 2d Hyrcanus and his heirs (14, 10, 6). When Herod the Great commenced operations, it was seized by him, lest he should leave a hostile stronghold in his rear when he marched upon Jerusalem (14, 15, 1), and

Augustus confirmed him in its possession (15, 7, 4). It was afterwards assigned to Archelaus when constituted ethnarch (17, 11,4), and passed with Syria under Cyrenius when Archelaus had been deposed (17, 12, 5). Under Cestius (i.e. Gessius Florus) it was destroyed amidst great slaughter of its inhabitants (*War*, 2, 18, 8, 10); and such a nest of pirates had it become when Vespasian arrived in those parts that it underwent a second and entire destruction, together with the adjacent villages, at his hands (3, 9, 3). Thus it appears that this port had already begun to be the den of robbers and outcasts which it was in Strabo's time (*Geograph.* 16, 759), while the district around it was so populous that from Jamnia, a neighboring town. and its vicinity, 40,000 armed men could be collected (ibid.). There was a vast plain around it, as we learn from *Josephus* (*Ant.* 13, 4, 4); it lay between Jamnia and Caesarea — the latter of which might be reached "on the morrow" from it (~~400~~ Acts 10:9 and 24) — not far from Lydda (~~408~~ Acts 9:38), and distant from Antipatris 150 stadia (*Joseph. Ant.* 13, 15, 1).

It was at Joppa, on the house top of Simon the tanner, "by the seaside" — with the view therefore circumscribed on the east by the high ground on which the town stood, but commanding a boundless prospect over the western waters — that the apostle Peter had his "vision of tolerance," as it has been happily designated, and went forth like a second Perseus — but from the east to emancipate, from still worse thralldom, the virgin daughter of the west. The Christian poet Arator has not failed to discover a mystical connection between the raising to life of the aged Tabitha — the occasion of Peter's visit to Joppa — and the baptism of the first Gentile household (*De Act. Apostol.* 1. 840, ap. Migne, *Patrol. Cours. Compl.* 68, 164).

In the 4th century Eusebius calls Joppa a city (*Onomast.* s.v.); and it was then made the seat of a bishopric, an honor which it retained till the conquest of the country by the Saracens (Reland, p. 868; S. Paul, *Geogr. Sac.* p. 305); the subscriptions of its prelates are preserved in the acts of various synods of the 5th and 6th centuries (Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* 3, 629). Joppa has been the landing place of pilgrims going to Jerusalem for more than a thousand years, from Arculf in the 7th century to his royal highness the prince of Wales in the 19th, and it is mentioned in almost all the itineraries and books of travel in the Holy Land which have appeared in different languages (*Early Travels in Pal.* p. 10, 34, 142, 286). None of the early travelers, however, give any explicit description of the place. During the Crusades Joppa was several times taken and retaken by Franks and

Saracens. It had been taken possession of by the forces of Godfrey de Bouillon previously to the capture of Jerusalem. The town had been deserted, and was allowed to fall into ruin, the Crusaders contenting themselves with possession of the citadel (William of Tyre, *Hist.* 8, 9); and it was in part assigned subsequently for the support of the Church of the Resurrection (*ibid.* 9, 16), though there seem to have been bishops of Joppa (perhaps only titular after all) between A.D. 1253 and 1363 (Le Quien, 1291; compare p. 1241). Saladin, in A.D. 1188, destroyed its fortifications (Sanut. *Secret. Fid. Crucis*, lib. 3, part 10, c. 5); but Richard of England, who was confined here by sickness, rebuilt them (*ibid.*, and Richard of Devizes in Bohn's *Ant. Lib.* p. 61). Its last occupation by Christians was that of St. Louis, A.D. 1253, and when he came it was still a city and governed by a count. "Of the immense sums," says Joinville, "which it cost the king to enclose Jaffa, it does not become me to speak, for they were countless. He enclosed the town from one side of the sea to the other; and there were twenty-four towers, including small and great. The ditches were well scoured, and kept clean, both within and without. There were three gates" (*Chronicles of Crus.* p. 495, Bohn). So restored, it fell into the hands of the sultans of Egypt, together with the rest of Palestine, by whom it was once more laid in ruins; so much so that Bertrand de la Brocquiere, visiting it about the middle of the 15th century, states that it then consisted only of a few tents covered with reeds, having been a strong place under the Christians. Guides, accredited by the sultan, here met the pilgrims and received the customary tribute from them; and here the papal indulgences offered to pilgrims commenced (*Early Travels*, p. 286). Finally, Jaffa fell under the Turks, in whose hands it still is, exhibiting the usual decrepitude of the cities possessed by them, and depending on Christian commerce for its feeble existence. During the period of their rule it has been three times sacked — by the Arabs in, 1722, by the Mamelukes in 1775, and lastly by Napoleon I in 1799, when a body of 4000 Albanians, who held a strong position in the town, surrendered on promise of having their lives spared. Yet the whole 4000 were afterwards pinioned and shot on the strand! When Napoleon was compelled to retreat to Egypt, between 400 and 500 French soldiers lay ill of the plague in the hospitals of Joppa. They could not be removed, and Napoleon ordered them to be poisoned! (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 288).

3. Description. — Yafa is the modern name of Joppa, and is identical with the old Hebrew *Japho*. It contains about 5000 inhabitants, of whom 1000

are Christians, about 150 Jews, and the rest Moslems. It is beautifully situated on a little rounded hill, dipping on the west into the waves of the Mediterranean, and on the land side encompassed by orchards of orange, lemon, apricot, and other trees, which for luxuriance and beauty are not surpassed in the world. They extend for several miles across the great plain. Like most Oriental towns, however, it looks best in the distance. The houses are huddled together without order; the streets are narrow, crooked, and filthy; the town is so crowded along the steep sides of the hill that the rickety dwellings in the upper part seem to be toppling over on the flat roofs of those below. The most prominent features of the architecture from without are the flattened domes by which most of the buildings are surmounted, and the appearance of arched vaults. But the aspect of the whole is mean and gloomy, and inside the place has all the appearance of a poor though large village. From the steepness of the site many of the streets are connected by flights of steps, and the one that runs along the seawall is the most clean and regular of the whole. There are three mosques in Joppa, and Latin, Greek, and Armenian convents. The former is that in which European pilgrims and travelers usually lodge. The bazaars are worth a visit. The chief manufacture is soap. It has no port, and it is only under favorable circumstances of wind and weather that vessels can ride at anchor a mile or so from the shore. There is a place on the shore which is called "the harbor." It consists of a strip of water from fifteen to twenty yards wide and two or three deep, enclosed on the sea side by a ridge of low and partially sunken rocks. It may afford a little shelter to boats, but it is worse than useless so far as commerce is concerned. The town is defended by a wall, on which a few old guns are mounted. With the exception of a few broken columns scattered about the streets, and through the gardens on the southern slope of the hill, and the large stones in the foundations of the castle, Joppa has no remains of antiquity; and none of its modern buildings, not even the reputed "house of Simon the tanner," which the monks show, are worthy of note, although the locality of the last is not badly chosen (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 263, 274; and see Seddon's *Memoir*, p. 86, 185). The town has still a considerable trade as the port of Jerusalem. The oranges of Jaffa are the finest in all Palestine and Syria; its pomegranates and watermelons are likewise in high repute, and its gardens and orange and citron groves deliciously fragrant and fertile. But among its population are fugitives and vagabonds from all countries; and Europeans have little security, whether of life or property, to induce a permanent

abode there. A British consul is now resident in the place, and a railroad has been projected to Jerusalem.

See Raumer's *Palästina*; Volney, 1, 136 sq.; Chateaubriand, 2, 103; Clarke, 4, 438 sq.; Buckingham, 1, 227 sq.; Richter, p. 12; Richardsun, 2, 16; Skinner, 1, 175-184; Robinson, 1, 18; Stent, 2, 27; M'Culloch's *Gazetteer*; Reland, p. 864; Cellar. *Not.* 2, 524; Hamelsveld, 1, 442; 2, 229, Hasselquist, p. 137; Niebuhr, 3, 41; Joliffe, p. 243; Light, p. 125; Ritter, *Erdk.* 2, 400; Schwarz, p. 142, 373, 375; Thomson, *Land and Book* 2, 273.

Jop'pe

(Ἰόππη), the Greek form (1 Esdr. 5:55; 1 Macc. 10:75, 76; 11:6; 12:33; 13:11; 14:5, 34; 15:28, 35; 2 Macc. 4:21; 12, 3, 7 [Ἰοππίτης]) of the name of the town JOPPA *SEE JOPPA* (q.v.).

Jo'rah

(Heb. *Yorah'*, *hr/y*, prob. for *hr/y*, *sprinkling*, or autumnal *rain*; Sept. Ἰωρά v.r. Οὐρά Vulg. *Jora*), a man whose descendants (or a place whose former inhabitants) to the number of 112 returned from the Babylonian captivity (^{<1528>}Ezra 2:18); called HARIPH in the parallel passage (^{<1672>}Nehemiah 7:24). "In Ezra two of De Rossi's MSS., and originally one of Kennicott's, had *hdwy*, i.e. Jodah, which is the reading of the Syriac and Arabic versions. One of Kennicott's MSS. had the original reading in Ezra altered to, *rwj*, i.e. Joram; and two in Nehemiah read, *yrj*, i.e. Harim, which corresponds with *Ἀρείμ* of the Alexandrian MS., and *Churom* of the Syriac. In any case, the change or confusion of letters which might have caused the variation of the name is so slight that it is difficult to pronounce. which is the true form, the corruption of Jorah into Hariph being as easily conceivable as the reverse. Burrington (*Geneal.* 2, 75) decides in favor of the latter, but from a comparison of both passages with ^{<1508>}Ezra 10:31 we should be inclined to regard Harim (*μῤῥ*) as the true reading in all cases. But, on any supposition, it is difficult to account for the form Azephurith. or, more properly, *Ἀρσιφομρίθ*, in 1 Esdr. 5:16, which Burrington considers as having originated in a corruption of the two readings in Ezra and Nehemiah, the second syllable arising from an error of the transcriber in mistaking the uncial E for Σ"

Jo'rai

(Heb. *Yoray'*, *yr'y*, perh. i.q. *Jorah*; Sept. *Ἰωρεέ*, Vulg. *Jorai*), the fourth name of the seven chieftains of the Gadites other than those resident in Bashan (^{<13B3>}1 Chronicles 5:13). B.C. perh. cir. 782. "Four of Kennicott's MSS., and the printed copy used by Luther, read *ydwy*, i.e. Jodai" (Smith).

Jo'ram

(Heb., *r'y*; Sept. *Ἰωράμ*), prop. a shortened form of the name JEHORAM (q.v.), for which it is indifferently used in the Heb., and arbitrarily in the A.V., as the following classification shows:

- a.** The son of the king of Zobah (^{<1080>}2 Samuel 8:10; Sept. *Ἰεδδουράμ*; elsewhere called HADORAM).
- b.** The king of Judah (^{<1082>}2 Kings 8:21, 23, 24; 11:2; ^{<13B1>}1 Chronicles 3:11; elsewhere *Jehoram*).
- c.** The king of Israel (^{<1086>}2 Kings 8:16, 25, 28 [twice], 29 [twice]; 9:14 [twice], 15, 16 [twice], 29; incorrectly for *Jehoram*, ^{<1097>}2 Kings 9:17, 21 [twice], 22, 23; elsewhere correctly so).
- d.** The Levite (^{<1365>}1 Chronicles 26:25, *ry*) i.e. By error for JOZABAD (1 Esdr. 1:9).

Jor'dan

(Heb. *Yarden'*, [^]*Dej*; always with the article [^]*Dejhi*; *Ἰορδάνης*), the chief and most celebrated river of Palestine, flowing through a deep valley down the center of the country from north to south. The principal river of the entire region. however (hence usually styled in the original "the River "), is the Euphrates (q.v.). *SEE RIVER*.

1. The Name. — This signifies *descender*, from the root *dry*; "to descend — a name most applicable to it, whether we consider the rapidity of its current, or the great depth of the valley through which it runs. From whatever part of the country its banks are approached, the descent is long and steep. That this is the true etymology of the word seems evident from an incidental remark in ^{<10816>}Joshua 3:16, where, in describing the effect of the opening of a passage for the Israelites, the word used for the "coming

down" of the waters (~~μυθηγενεα~~) is almost the same as the name of the river (see Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 279, note). Other derivations have been given. Some say it is compounded of ~~ρα~~ *a river*, and ~~δι~~ the name of the city where it rises, but this etymology is impossible (Reland, *Paloe*st. p. 271). Another view is, that the river having two sources, the name of the one was *Jor*, and of the other *Dan*; hence the united stream is called *Jordan*. So Jerome (*Comm. in* ~~<063>~~ *Matthew* 16:13). This theory has been copied by Adamnanus (*De Loc. Sanct.* 2, 19), William of Tyre (8, 18), Brocardus (p. 3), Adrichomius (p. 109), and others; and the etymology seems to have spread among the Christians in Palestine, from whom Burckhardt heard it (*Travels in Syria*, p. 42, 43; see Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3, 412, note). Arab geographers call the river either *El-Urdon*, which is equivalent to the Hebrew, or *Esh-sheria*h, which signifies "the watering place;" and this latter is the name almost universally given to it by the modern Syrians, who sometimes attach the appellation *el-Kebir*, "the great," by way of distinction from the Sheriat el-Mandhur, or Hieromax.

2. Sources. — The snows that deeply cover Hermon during the whole winter, and that still cap its glittering summit during the hottest days of summer, are the real springs of the Jordan. They feed its perennial fountains, and they supply from a thousand channels those superabundant waters which make the river "overflow all its banks in harvest time" (~~<065>~~ *Joshua* 3:15). The Jordan has two *historical* sources.

a. In the midst of a rich but marshy plain, lying between the southern prolongation of Hermon and the mountains of Naphtali, is a low cup shaped hill, thickly covered with shrubs. On it once stood Dan, the northern border city of Palestine; and from its western base gushes forth the great fountain of the Jordan. The waters at once form a large pond encircled with rank grass and jungle — now the home of the wild boar — and then flow off southward. Within the rim of the cup, beneath the spreading branches of a gigantic oak, is a smaller spring. It is fed, doubtless, by the same source, and its stream, breaking through the rim, joins its sister, and forms a river some forty feet wide, deep and rapid. The modern name of the hill is Tell el-Kady, "the hill of the judge;" and both fountain and river are called Leddan — evidently the name Dan corrupted by a double article, Eled-Dan (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3, 394; Thomson, *Land and Book*, p. 214; and in *Bibliotheca Sac.* 1846, p. 196). Josephus calls this stream "Little Jordan" (~~τὸν μικρὸν Ἰορδάνην~~, *War*, 4, 1, 1; comp.

Ant. 1, 10, 1; 8, 8, 4); but it is the principal source of the river, and the largest fountain in Syria.

b. Four miles east of Tell el-Kady, on a lower terrace of Hermon, amid forests of oak, lie the ruins of Baniyas, the ancient Caesarea-Philippi, and more ancient Panium. Beside the ruins is a lofty cliff of red limestone, having a large fountain at its base. Beneath the cliff there was formerly, as Josephus tells us, a gloomy cave, and within it a yawning abyss of unfathomable depth, filled with water. This was the other source of the Jordan (*War*, 1, 21, 3; comp. *Ant.* 15, 10, 3; Pliny, 5, 12; Mishna, *Para*, 8, 12). A temple was erected over the cave by Herod, and its ruins now fill it and conceal the fountain. From it a foaming torrent still bursts, and dashes down to the plain through a narrow rocky ravine, and then glides swiftly on till it joins the other about four miles south of Tell el-Kady (Robinson, 3, 397; Porter *Handbook*, p. 446).

c. The Jordan has also a *fabled* fountain, thus described by Josephus: "Apparently Panium is the source of the Jordan, but the water is, in reality, conveyed thither unseen by a subterranean channel from Phiala, as it is called, which lies not far from the high road, on the right as you ascend to Trachonitis, at the distance of 120 stadia from Caesarea.... That the Jordan hence derived its origin was formerly unknown, until it was ascertained by Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, who, having thrown chaff into Phiala, found it cast out at Panium" (*War*, 3, 10, 7). The lake here referred to appears to be Burket er-Ram, which Robinson visited and described (*Bib. Res.* 3, 399). The legend has no foundation in reality.

d. Other fountains in this region, though unnamed in history, contribute much to the Jordan. The chief of these, and the highest perennial source of the Jordan, is in the bottom of a valley at the western base of Hermon, a short distance from the town of Hasbeiya, and twelve miles north of Tell el-Kady. The fountain is in a pool at the foot of a basalt cliff; the stream from it, called Hasbany (from Hasbeiya), flows through a narrow glen into the plain, and falls into the main stream about a mile south of the junction of the Leddan and Baniasy. The relative size of the three streams Robinson thus estimates: "That from Baniyas is twice as large as the Hasbany, while the Leddan is twice, if not three times the size of that from Baniyas" (*Bib. Res.* 3, 395). The united river flows southward through the marshy plain for six miles, and then falls into Lake Huleh, called in Scripture "The Waters of Merom." *SEE MEROM.*

e. Besides these, a considerable stream comes down from the plain of Ijon, west of the Hasbany; and two large fountains (called Balat and Mellahah) burst forth from the base of the mountain chain of Naphtali (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 436).

3. *Physical Features of the Jordan and its Valley.* — The most remarkable feature of the Jordan is, that throughout nearly its entire course *it is below the level of the sea*. Its valley is thus like a huge fissure in the earth's crust. The following measurements, taken from Van de Velde's *Memoir* accompanying his *Map*, will give the best idea of the depression of this singular valley:

Fountain of Jordan at Hasbeiya... 1700 ft. elevation.
 Fountain of Jordan at Banias..... 1147 ft. elevation.
 Fountain of Jordan at Dan..... 647 ft. elevation.
 Lake Hileh.....about 120 ft. elevation.
 Lake of Tiberias..... 650 ft. *depression*.
 Dead Sea..... 1312 ft. *depression*.

There may be some error in the elevations of the fountains as here given. Lake Haleh is encompassed by a great plain, extending to Dan; and as it appears to the eye almost level, it is difficult to believe that there could be a difference of 500 feet in the elevations of the fountain and the lake. Porter estimated it on the spot at not above 100 feet; but it is worthy of note that Von Wildenbruch makes it by measurement 537 feet, and De Bertou 344.

The general course of the Jordan is due south. From their fountains the three streams flow south to the points of junction, and continue in the same direction to the Huleh; and from the southern extremity of this lake the Jordan again issues and resumes its old course. For some two miles its banks are flat, and its current not very rapid; but on passing through Jisr Benat Yakub ("the Bridge of Jacob's Daughters"), the banks suddenly contract and rise high on each side, and the river dashes in sheets of foam over a rocky bed, rebounding from cliff to cliff in its mad career. Here and there the retreating banks have a little green meadow, with its fringe of oleanders all wet and glistening with spray. Thus it rushes on, often winding, occasionally doubling back like the coils of a serpent, till, breaking from rocky barriers, it enters the rich plain of Batihah, where on the left bank stand the ruins of Bethsaida (q.v.). The stream now expands, and glides lazily along till it falls on the still bosom of the Sea of Galilee. Between Bethsaida and the sea the Jordan averages about twenty yards in

width, and flows sluggishly between low alluvial banks. Bars of sand extend across its channel here and there, at which it is easily forded (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 426; Robinson, 2, 414 sq.; Burckhardt, *Symria*, p. 315). From Jisr Benat Yakub the distance is only seven miles, and yet in that distance the river falls 700 feet. The total length of the section between the two lakes is about eleven miles as the crow flies.

An old tradition tells us that the Jordan flows direct through the Sea of Galilee without mingling with its waters. The origin of the story may be the fact that the river enters the lake at the northern extremity, and leaves it at a point exactly opposite at the southern, without apparent increase or diminution.

The *third section* of the river, lying between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, is the Jordan of Scripture, the other two sections not being directly mentioned either in the O.T. or N.T. Until the last few years little was known of it. The notices of ancient geographers are not full. Travelers had crossed it at several points, but all the portions between these points were unknown. When the remarkable depression of the Dead Sea was ascertained by trigonometrical measurement, and when it was shown that the Jordan must have a fall of 1400 feet in its short course of about 100 miles, the measurements were called in question by that distinguished geographer Dr. Robinson, in a paper read before the Royal Geographical Society in 1847 (*Journal*, vol. 18, part 2). In that same year lieutenant Molyneux, R.N., conveyed a boat from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, mostly in the river, but in places on the backs of camels, where rocks and rapids prevented navigation. Owing to the hostility of the Arabs the expedition was not successful, and the Jordan was not yet explored. Lieutenant Lynch, of the United States Navy, headed a much more successful expedition in 1848, and was the first fully to describe the course, and fully to solve the mysteries of the Jordan. His *Official Report* is the standard work on the river. Molyneux's paper in the *Journal of the Royal Geog. Society* also contains some useful matter (vol. 18, part 2).

The valley through which this section of the Jordan flows is a long, low plain, running from north to south, and shut in by steep and rugged parallel ridges, the eastern ridge rising fully 5000 feet above the river's bed, and the western about 3000. This plain is the *great plain* of the later Jews; the *great desert* (πολλήνερημίαν) of Josephus; the *Aulon*. or "channel" of the Greek geographers; the "region of Jordan" of the N.T. (Matthew

3:5; ~~CRB~~ Luke 3:3); and the *Ghor* or "sunken plain" of the modern Arabs (Stanley, p. 277; Josephus, *War*, 3, 9, 7; 4, 8, 2; Reland, *Paloest.* p. 305, 361, 377 sq.). It is about six miles wide at its northern end, but it gradually expands until it attains a width of upwards of twelve at Jericho. Its sides are not straight lines, nor is its surface perfectly level. The mountains on each side here and there send out rocky spurs, and long, low roots far into it. Winter torrents, descending from wild ravines, cut deeply through its soft strata. As a whole it is now a desert. In its northern division, above the fords of Succoth, small portions are cultivated around fountains, and along the banks of streamlets, where irrigation is easy; but all the rest is a wilderness — in spring covered with rank grass and thistles, but in summer parched and bare. The southern section — known as the "plain of Jericho" — is different in aspect. Its surface is covered with a white nitrous crust, like hoarfrost. through which not a blade of grass or green herb springs. Nothing could be imagined more dreary or desolate than this part of the plain.

Down the midst of the plain winds a ravine, varying from 200 yards to half a mile in breadth, and from 40 to 150 feet in depth. Through this the Jordan flows in a tortuous course, now sweeping the western, and now the eastern bank; now making a wide, graceful curve, and now doubling back, but everywhere fringed by a narrow, dense border of trees and shrubs. The river has thus two distinct lines of banks. The first or lower banks confine the stream, and are from five to ten feet high, the height of course decreasing in spring when the river is high; the second or upper are at some distance from the channel, and in places rise to a height of 150 feet. The scenery of the river is peculiar and striking. Lynch thus describes the upper section: "The high alluvial terraces on each side were everywhere shaped by the action of the winter rains into numbers of conical hills, some of them pyramidal and cuneiform, presenting the appearance of a giant encampment. This singular conformation extended southwards as far as the eye could reach. At intervals I caught a glimpse of the river in its graceful meanderings, sometimes glittering like a spearhead through an opening in the foliage, and again clasping some little island in its shining arms, or, far away, snapping with the fierceness and white foam of a torrent by some projecting point.... The banks were fringed with the lauarustinus, the oleander, the willow, and the tamarisk, and further inland, on the slope of the second terrace, grew a small species of oak, and the cedar."

The Jordan issues from the Sea of Galilee close to the hills on the western side of the plain, and sweeps round a little peninsula, on which lie the ruins of Tarichaea (Porter, *Handb.* p. 321; Robinson, 1, 538). The stream is about 100 feet wide, and the current strong (Lynch). A short distance down are the remains of a Roman bridge, whose fallen arches greatly obstruct the river, and make it dash through in sheets of foam. Below this are several weirs, constructed of rough stones, and intended to raise the water and turn it into canals, so as to irrigate the neighboring plain (Molyneux). Five miles from the lake the Jordan receives its largest tributary, the Sheriat el-Mandhur (the Hieromax of the Greeks), which drains a large section of Bashan and Gilead. This stream is 130 feet wide at its mouth. Two miles further is Jisr el-Mejamia, the only bridge now standing on the Lower Jordan. It is a quaint structure, one large pointed arch spanning the stream, and double tiers of smaller arches supporting the roadway on each side. The river is here deep and impetuous, breaking over high ledges of rocks.

Below this point the ravine inclines eastwards to the center of the plain, and its banks contract. Its sides are bare and white, and the chalky strata are deeply furrowed. The margin of the river has still its beautiful fringe of foliage, and the little islets which occur here and there are covered with shrubbery. Fifteen miles south of the bridge, wady Yabes (so called from Jabesh-gilead), containing a winter torrent, falls in from the east. A short distance above it a barren sandy island divides the channel, and with its bars on each side forms a ford, probably the one by which Jacob crossed as the site of Succoth has been identified on the western, bank. The plain round Succoth is extensively cultivated, and abundantly watered by fountains and streamlets from the adjoining mountains. The richness of the soil is wonderful. Dr. Robinson says, "The grass, intermingled with tall daisies and wild oats, reached to our horses' backs, while the thistles sometimes over topped the riders' heads. All was now dry, and in some places it was difficult to make our way through this exuberant growth." (3, p. 313). Jacob exercised a wise choice when "he made booths for his cattle" at this favored spot (⁴⁰³¹⁷Genesis 33:17). No other place in the great plain equals it in richness. The ravine of the Jordan is here 150 feet below the plain, and shut in by steep, bare banks of chalky strata (Robinson, *l.c.* p. 316). About nine miles below Succoth, and about halfway between the lakes, the Jabbok, the only other considerable tributary, falls into the Jordan, coming down through a deep, wild glen in the mountains of Gilead.

When Lynch passed (April 17) it was "a small stream trickling down a deep and wide torrent bed.... There was another bed, quite dry, showing that in times of freshet there were two outlets." Lynch gives some good pictures of the scenery above the junction. "The plain that sloped away from the bases of the hills was broken into ridges and multitudinous cone like mounds... A low, pale yellow ridge of conical hills marked the termination of the higher terrace, beneath which swept gently this low plain, with a similar undulating surface, half redeemed from barrenness by sparse verdure and thistle-covered hillocks. Still lower was the valley of the Jordan — its banks fringed with perpetual verdure — winding a thousand graceful mazes... its course a bright line in this cheerless waste."

Below the Jabbok the fall of the river is still greater than above, but there is less obstruction from rocks and cliffs. The jungles along the banks become denser, the sides of the river glen more regular, and the plain above more dreary and desolate.

On approaching the Dead Sea, the plain of the Jordan attains its greatest breadth — about twelve miles. The mountain ranges on each side are — higher, more rugged, and more desolate. The plain is coated with a nitrous crust, like hoarfrost, and not a tree, shrub, or blade of grass is seen except by fountains or rivulets. The glen winds like a serpent through the center, between two tiers of banks. The bottom is smooth, and sprinkled on the outside with stunted shrubs. The river winds in ceaseless coils along the bottom, now touching one side and now another, with its beautiful border of green foliage, looking all the greener from contrast with the desert above. The banks are of soft clay, in places ten feet high; the stream varies from 80 to 150 feet in breadth, and from five to twelve in depth. Near its mouth the current becomes more sluggish, and the stream expands. Where wady Hesban falls in, Lynch found the river 150 feet wide and 11 deep, "the current four knots." Further down the banks are low and sedgy; the width gradually increases to 180 yards at its mouth, but the depth is only three feet (Lynch, *Official Report*; Robinson, 1, 538 sq.; Stanley, p. 290).

Picture for Jordan 1

Lynch in a few words explains the secret of the great and almost incredible fall in the Jordan. "The great secret is solved by the tortuous course of the Jordan. In a space of 60 miles of latitude, and four or five of longitude, the Jordan traverses at least 200 miles.... We have plunged down twenty-seven threatening rapids, besides a great many of lesser magnitude."

Picture for Jordan 2

Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 2, 257 sq.) describes the banks as consisting of three series, with terraces between, the outer ones composed of the mountains bordering the river, the middle ones being the true bank, and the third the proper channel of the stream; and he argues that the scriptural allusions to the overflow of the Jordan at harvest (^{<4685>}Joshua 3:15; ^{<325>}1 Chronicles 12:15; compare ^{<2125>}Jeremiah 12:5; 49:19; 1, 44; ^{<3108>}Zechariah 11:3; Sirach 24:26, 36) simply refer to the full stream, or at most to its expansion as far as to the middle one of these three banks, at the time of the annual melting of snows on Lebanon and Hermon, rather than to any true freshet or inundation. The river in this respect probably resembles other mountain streams, which have an overflow of their secondary boundaries or alluvial "bottoms" during the spring and early summer months. Comp. Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 452 sq.

4. *The Fords* of the Jordan have always been important in connection with the history of the country. The three streams which flow from the fountains are fordable at almost every point. It is south of Lake Huleh that the river begins to form a serious barrier. The bridge called Jisr Benat Yakub has for centuries been the leading pass from western Palestine to Damascus. The first reference to it is in A.D. 1450 (in Gumpenberg's day; see Robinson, *Researches*, 3, 362), though as early as the Crusades a "Ford of Jacob" (Vadum Jacob, Will. Tyr. *Hist.* 18, 13) is mentioned, and was reckoned a most important pass. The bridge was probably built during the 15th century, when the caravan road was constructed from Damascus to Egypt (Porter, *Handbook*, 2, 466). The origin of the name, "Bridge of Jacob's Daughters," is unknown. Perhaps this place may have been confounded with the ford of Succoth, where the patriarch crossed the Jordan or perhaps the "Jacob" referred to was some Muslim saint or Turkish pasha (Ritter, *Pal. and Syr.* p. 269 sq.). **SEE BRIDGE.**

Between Bethsaida-Julias and the Sea of Galilee there are several fords. The river is there shallow and the current sluggish. At this place the multitudes that followed our Lord from Capernaum and the neighborhood were able to cross the river to where he fed the 5000 (^{<4062>}Mark 6:32 sq.; Robinson, 2, 414).

The first ford on the southern section of the Jordan is about half a mile from the lake, where the ruins of the Roman bridge now lie. It was the means of communication between Tiberias and Gadara, and it was

doubtless at this point our Lord crossed when he went from Galilee to Judaea "by the farther side of Jordan" (^{<A110>}Mark 10:1; ^{<A100>}Matthew 19:1, 2). Jisr el-Mejamia is a Saracenic bridge on an old caravan route from Damascus to Egypt. Probably a Roman bridge may have stood at the same place, connecting Scythopolis with the other cities of Decapolis. There is no *ford* here. At a point east of the ruins of Scythopolis, ten miles below the bridge, the river is *now* fordable, but the passage is deep and dangerous (Robinson, 3, 325; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 137).

At Succoth is one of the best and most important fords over the Jordan. Here Jacob crossed with his cattle. This, too, is possibly the Bethbarah, "house, or ford of passage," where the Israelites intercepted the routed Midianites (^{<A1024>}Judges 7:24), and it was probably here that the men of Gilead slew the Ephraimites (12:6). Not far off, in "the clay ground between Succoth and Zarthan," were the brass foundries of king Solomon (^{<A1074>}1 Kings 7:46). These fords undoubtedly witnessed the first recorded passage of the Jordan in the O.T.; we say recorded, because there can be little dispute but that Abraham must have crossed it likewise. It is still the place at which the eastern Bedawin cross in their periodical invasions of Esdraelon. From Succoth to the mouth of the Jabbok the river becomes very low during the summer, and is fordable at many points. At one spot are the remains of a Roman bridge (Molyneux, p. 115 sq.; Lynch, April 16; Burckhardt, p. 344 sq.). Ten miles south of the Jabbok there is a noted ford on the road from Nabulus to Es-Salt. Traces of a Roman road and bridge were here discovered by Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 124). The only other fords of note are those in the plain of Jericho, one above and one below the pilgrims' bathing place. They are much deeper than those higher up, and when the river is swollen they become impassable.

Picture for Jordan 3

5. Historical Notices. — The first notice of the Jordan is in the story of the separation of Abraham and Lot — Lot "beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah" (^{<A1130>}Genesis 13:10). Abraham had just left Egypt (12:10-20), and therefore the comparison between the fertilizing properties of the Jordan and of the Nile is very apposite. The section of the valley visible from the heights of Bethel, where the patriarchs stood, was the plain of Jericho and southward over a part of the Dead Sea. The "plain" or *circle* (^{<A1130>}Genesis 13:10) of the Jordan must have been different then from what it is now. It

is now a parched desert — then it was well watered everywhere. The waters of numerous springs, mountain torrents, and probably of the Jordan, raised by weirs such as are seen at its northern end, were used by the old Phoenician inhabitants in the irrigation of the vast plain. The curse had not yet come upon it; the fire of heaven had not yet passed over it; the Lord had not yet destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah (Stanley, p. 215). It is manifest that some great physical change was produced in the valley by the convulsion at the destruction of the cities. The bed of the Dead Sea was probably lowered, and a greater fall thus given to the river. *SEE DEAD SEA.*

Another wonderful epoch in the Jordan's history was the passage of the Israelites. They were encamped on the "plains of Moab" — on the broad plain east of the river, extending along the northern shore of the sea to the foot of the mountains. It was harvest time — the beginning of April — when the rains were still falling heavily in Hermon, and the winter snows were melting under the rays of the warm sun, and when a thousand mountain torrents thus fed swept into the Jordan, and made it "overflow all its banks;" or, as the Hebrew literally signifies, *made it full up to all its banks* (see Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 1, 540); that is, perhaps, up not merely to the banks of the stream itself, but up to the banks of the glen; covering, as it still does in a few places (Molyneux, p. 116; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 125), the whole bottom of the glen, and thus rendering the fords impassable for such a host as the Israelites. There can be no doubt that in ancient times the Jordan rose higher than it does now. When the country was more thickly wooded and more extensively cultivated, more rain and more snow must have fallen (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, 2, 272). There are wet seasons even yet, when the river rises several feet more than ordinarily (Reland, p. 273; Raumer, *Paläst.* p. 61, 2d ed.). The opening of a passage through the river at such a season was the greater miracle. Had it been late in summer it might have been thought that natural causes operated, but in harvest — the time of the overflow — the finger of God must have been manifest to all. It is a remarkable fact that at this same spot the Jordan was afterwards twice miraculously opened — by Elijah and Elisha (^{<1118>}2 Kings 2:8, 14).

At a later period it was considered a feat of high daring that a party of David's "mighty men" crossed the Jordan "in the first month (April), when it had overflowed all its banks," and subdued their enemies on the east side (^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 12:15). Jeremiah speaks of the lions "coming up" from

the "swellings of the Jordan;" but the Hebrew word *~ /aG*; signifies *beauty* or *glory*, and refers to the dense jungles and verdant foliage of its banks; these jungles are impenetrable except to the wild beasts that dwell there. No allusion is made to the rise or overflow of the river (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s.v.; Robinson, 1, 540). Travelers have often seen wild; swine, hyenas, and jackals, and also the tracks of panthers, on the banks of the Jordan (Molyneux, p. 118).

The passage of the river by king David in his flight from Absalom has one peculiarity — a *ferry boat* was used to convey his household over the channel (~~2~~ 2 Samuel 19:18). The passage was probably effected at one of the fords in the plain of Jericho. The word *hrb*[simply signifies a thing for crossing; it may have been a "boat," or a "raft," or a few inflated skins, such as are represented on the monuments of Nineveh, and are still used on the Euphrates and the Jordan. *SEE FERRY*.

Naaman's indignant depreciation of the Jordan, as compared with the "rivers of Damascus," is well known. The rivers of Damascus water its great plain, converting a desert into a paradise; the Jordan rolls on in its deep bed, useless, to the Sea of Death.

The great event of the N.T. history enacted at the Jordan was the baptism of our Lord. This has made it the queen of rivers, and has given it the title "sacred." The exact spot is disputed. *SEE BETHBARA*; *SEE AENON*. The topography and the incidents of the narrative, both before and after the baptism, unquestionably point to the same place, already famous as the scene of three miracles (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 198). In commemoration of the baptism, the Christian pilgrims who assemble at Jerusalem at Easter visit the Jordan in a body and bathe at this spot (Stanley, p. 308).

The references to the Jordan in the writings of Josephus contain nothing of importance beyond what has already been mentioned in connection with the fountains and the physical features. Greek and Roman geographers seem to have known but little of the river. Pliny praises its beauty, and states that, "with the greatest reluctance, as it were, it moves onward towards Asphaltites, a lake of gloomy and unpropitious nature, by which it is at last swallowed up" (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 15). Strabo makes the singular assertion that it is "navigated *upwards* with vessels of burden!" Of course, he can only refer to the Sea of Galilee (16, 2, 16). Pausanias tells how strangely the river disappears in the Dead Sea (book 5, 7, 4).

6. Mineral, Animal, and Vegetable Productions. — Some of these have been incidentally noticed above. As there were slime pits, or pits of bitumen, and salt pits (~~Gen~~Genesis 11:3; ~~Zeph~~Zephaniah 2:9) in the vale of Siddim; on the extreme south, so Mr. Thompson speaks of bitumen wells twenty minutes from the bridge over the Hashbeiya on the extreme north; while Ain-el Mellahah above Lake-Huleh is emphatically "the fountain of the salt works" (Lynch's *Narrative*, p. 470). Thermal springs are frequent about the Lake of Tiberias; the most celebrated, below the town bearing that name (Robinson, 2, 384, 385); some near Emmaus (Lynch, p. 467), some near Magdala, and some not far from Gadara (Irby., p. 90, 91). The hill of Dan is said to be an extinct crater, and masses of volcanic rock and tufa are noticed by Lynch not far from the mouth of the Yermak (*Narrative*, April 12). Dark basalt is the characteristic of the rocks in the upper stage; trap, limestone, sandstone, and conglomerate in the lower. On the second day of the passage a bank of fuller's earth was observed.

How far the Jordan in olden time was ever a zone of cultivation, like the Nile, is uncertain. Now, with the exception of the eastern shores of the Lake Huleh, the hand of man may be said to have disappeared from its banks. The genuine Arab is a nomad by nature, and contemns agriculture. There, however, Dr. Robinson, in the month of May, found the land tilled almost down to the lake, and large crops of wheat, barley, maize, sesame, and rice rewarded the husbandman. Horses, cattle, and sheep — all belonging to the Ghawarinah tribe — fattened on the rich pasture; and large herds of black buffaloes luxuriated in the streams and in the deep mire of the marshes (3, 396). These are doubtless lineal descendants of the "fat bulls of Bashan;" as the "oaks of Bashan" are still the magnificent staple tree of those regions. Cultivation degenerates as we advance southward. Cornfields wave around Gennesareth on the west, and the palm and vine, fig and pomegranate, are still to be seen here and there. Melons grown on its shores are of great size and much esteemed. Pink oleanders, and a rose colored species of hollyhock, in great profusion, wait upon every approach to a rill or spring. These gems of nature reappear in the lower course of the Jordan. There the purple thistle, the bright yellow marigold, and scarlet anemone, saluted the adventurers of the New World: the laurustinus and oleander, cedar and arbutus, willow and tamarisk, accompanied them on their route. As the climate became more tropical, and the Lower Ghor was entered, large ghurrah trees, like the aspen, with silvery foliage, overhung them; and the cane, frequently impenetrable; and now in blossom, "was

ever at the water's edge." Only once during the whole voyage, on the fourth day, were patches of wheat and barley visible; but the hand that had sowed them lived far away. As Jeremiah in the O.T., and St. Jerome and Phocas (see Relaud) among Christian pilgrims, had spoken of the Jordan as the resort of lions, so tracks of tigers, wild boars, and the like presented themselves from time to time to these explorers. Flocks of wild ducks, of cranes, of pigeons, and of swallows were scared by their approach; and a specimen of the bulbul, or Syrian nightingale, fell into their hands. The scenery throughout was not inspiring — it was of a subdued character when they started, profoundly gloomy and dreary near ford Sukwa, and then utterly sterile just before they reached Jericho. With the exception of a few Arab tribes — so savage as: scarcely to be considered exceptions — humanity had become extinct on its banks.

Such, then, is the river Jordan, without any parallel, historical or physical, in the whole world.. A complete river beneath the level of the sea! Disappearing in a lake which has no outlet, which could have none, and which originated in a miracle! Thrice were its waters divided by the direct agency of God, that his servants; might pass in safety and comfort. It is a river that has never been navigable, flowing into a sea that has never known a port — has never been a high road to more hospitable coasts — has never possessed a fishery — a river that has never boasted of a single town of eminence upon its banks; in fine, it is, if not "the river of God" in the book of Psalms, at least that of his chosen people throughout their history, and as such, it figures largely in the poetical symbolism of the passage from this world to the next.

In addition to the works above cited on the physical features of the Jordan, the following afford important information: *Journal of R. Geog. Society*, 18, part 2, articles by Robinson, Petermann, and Molyneux; Bertou, in *Bulletin de la Soc. Geograph. de Paris*, 12, 166 sq.; Wildenbruch, *Monatsberichte der Gesellschaft fur Erdkunde zu Berlin*, 1845-46; Capt. Newbold, *Jour. of Roy. Asiat. Society*, 16, 8 sq.; Rev. W. Thompson, *Bibl. Sac.* 3, 184 sq. A clear summary of all known about the Jordan up to 1850 is given by Ritter, in *Palastina und Syrien*, 2, 152-556; also in his separate essay, *Der Jordan und die Beschiffung des todten Meeres* (Berlin, 1850). More popular descriptions are those published by the Religious Tract Society (London, 1858), and Nelson (ib. 1854). Most travelers in Palestine have likewise given an account of the river, chiefly at its mouth. **SEE PALESTINE.**

Jordan, Joseph

a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Nansemond County, Va., in 1695, and began preaching about 1718, first in the States, and later in various parts of England and Ireland, and some portions of Holland. He died Sept. 26, 1735. "He acquitted himself," was the testimony of the annual meeting of Virginia Quakers in the year of his death, "as a workman that need not be ashamed." See Janney, *Hist. of friends*, 3, 261.

Jordan, Richard (1).

a minister of the Society of Friends was born in Nansemond County, Va., in 1693, and began preaching the same year with his younger brother Joseph (see above). The two brothers frequently traveled together, preaching the word of God, in Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina, and suffered no little from persecution. In 1728 he visited the Quakers in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and in Barbados. After two years he returned to the States, and settled in Philadelphia, where he died August 5, 1742. "His ministry was convincing and consolatory, his delivery graceful, but unaffected; in prayer he was solemn and reverent." See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, 3, 270.

Jordan, Richard (2),

a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Norfolk County, Va., Dec. 12, 1756. He entered on ministerial labors in 1797 in New York and New England, and in 1802 visited Europe, where he spent two years. On his return he settled at Hartford, Conn., and five years later removed to Newton, N. J., where he died Oct. 14, 1826. He was an able minister of the Gospel, devoted to the service of his heavenly Master. See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, 4, 105.

Jordanes.

SEE JORNANDEZ.

Jordanus Da Giano, Or De Yane.

SEE MINORITES.

Jordanus Of Saxona

second general of the Dominicans, was born at Borrentrick, in the diocese of Paderborn, near the close of the twelfth century. After studying theology at the University of Paris, he joined the Dominicans in 1219, and in 1220 took part in the first general chapter of his order. In 1221 he was made prior of the province of Lombardy, and finally elected general in 1222, ten months after the death of St. Dominic. The order grew rapidly under his administration, and soon possessed establishments as far as Poland, and even in Palestine, whither Jordanus went in 1228. The ship was wrecked on the return voyage, and Jordanus drowned, in 1236. He wrote, *De Principio Ordinis Proedicatorum* (Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Proedicatorum*, vol. 1): — *Epistola de Translatione corporis B. Dominici* (Bzovius, *Annales*, 1233, vol. 1): — *Super Priscianum, et quaedam grammaticalia*, a MS. in the Leipzig Library. See *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb., 2, 720; Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Proedicatorum*, 6, 93; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 26, 941. (J.N.P.)

Jor'ibas

(1 Esdr. 8:44) or Jor'ibus (1 Esdr. 9:19), Graecized forms (Ἰώριβος, Vulg. *Joribus*) of the name JARIB *SEE JARIB* (q.v.) of two persons (corresponding to ^{<151816>}Ezra 8:16, and ^{<151018>}Ezra 10:18, in the Hebrew text of the above passages respectively).

Jo'rim

(Ἰωρείμ, perh. i.q. *Joram*), the son of Matthat and father of Eleazar, maternal ancestors of Jesus, not mentioned in the O. Test. (^{<1119>}Luke 3:29). B.C. post 876. *SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST*.

Joris, David

(really JORISZON, i.e. *Georg'sson*, hence also called *Georgii*), DAVID, founder of an Anabaptist sect of the 16th century, known under the name of *Davidists*, or more generally under that of *Jorists*, himself altogether a most extraordinary character was born either in 1501 or 1502, at Delft, in Holland, or, as Nippold thinks, at Ghent. He has generally been spoken of as of low parentage, but Nippold holds that David's father was originally a merchant, and afterwards the head of a company who went about acting the play of the life of David the psalmist, but that his mother was of noble

origin. David was early placed at school, but the boy's inclination was more to a roving life, like that of his father, than to books. He early evinced a particular fondness for the art of glass painting. He was therefore finally taken from school and apprenticed to a glass painter, and soon displayed great aptitude in his profession. To perfect himself in this art he set out on a journey to neighboring countries, and traveled through Belgium, France, and England, until a dangerous disease hastened his return to Holland. He now (1524) settled at Delft, and married. Hitherto the young painter had displayed no extraordinary religious zeal; it is true he had been strict in all his religious observances, and had frequently declared himself in favor of vital piety, but this, at a time when the reformatory movement was in its infancy, was not remarkable. Even now he continued his attention to his business, and only on a few public occasions during the religious commotions of this time he dropped a word against the fanatic zeal of the Romish clergy, and the religious excesses of the Romish Church. In 1530, however, he appears more prominently on the stage. It is true he had previously written a few pamphlets against Romanism, but these had failed to provoke reply, or a demand for interference on the part of the authorities. But this year, while a procession of Roman Catholics was moving through the streets of Delft, he stopped the priests and accused them of the crime of deceiving the people by false teachings; he especially reproached them for their worship of images and pictures. The burgomaster of Delft favored Joris not a little, being a friend of his; but this daring action could not go unpunished, and Joris was arrested and imprisoned for some time. After a trial, however, he escaped, no doubt by the aid of his friend, without any severe punishment. He quitted Delft for six years, and it was during his wanderings at this time that he became estranged from the true Reformation principles and an adherent to Anabaptist views, and finally even the founder of an independent sect. His roving life, so vary much akin to that of all the Anabaptist leaders, inclined him to their cause; but, being as yet more moderate than they, and opposed to their tumultuous proceedings, especially to their views of establishing their authority by the sword, it was not until 1534 that he actually joined them by rebaptism. At this time the Anabaptists were at the zenith of their success, especially, at Munster. *SEE ANABAPTISTS*. Being requested to preach and espouse their cause before the people, he at first hesitated, and pleaded incompetency; but at last was prevailed upon, and was consecrated by Dammas, Ubbo, and others as bishop of Delft. The same zeal which he had manifested in the cause, of the Lutherans he now displayed in behalf

of the Anabaptists, and we may infer from the hesitancy of the authorities to interfere with Joris that his influence had become quite extended and his followers very numerous. Certainly Joris himself was quite conscious of the extent of his power, and he hesitated not to use it for the accomplishment of the one great object that seemed to be nearest his heart, the union of all Anabaptist forces under one common leader, the secure establishment of the principles which he himself espoused, and which no doubt he as yet believed to be based on the Scriptures and indorsed by divine favor. But his course soon, aroused suspicion among the other Anabaptist leaders. They were not slow to recognize in Joris an able and determined leader, and, jealous of the success he had already achieved, and fearful of their own position, they, openly disavowed him. Such a course was adopted, especially, by Batenburg himself, the founder of an Anabaptist sect, a determined ruffian, void of all feelings who, under the garb of religion, sought the enjoyment of wealth and power. He preached the extinction of all non-Anabaptists by the sword. Strangely enough, however, his very followers, after his decease, became the most faithful adherents of Joris. Opposed within the camp of the Anabaptists, Joris, in 1536, at the Convocation of Anabaptists, held at Bocholt, assumed a still more independent position, and proudly declared himself divinely appointed as leader. This further provoked, the jealousy of the other leaders; and as, immediately after the Convocation of Bocholt, Joris issued a pamphlet calling all parties to a peaceful union, the wrath of the different leaders was stimulated anew, and resulted in an entire estrangement of most of the Anabaptists. Those who now continued to espouse his cause were hereafter known as *Jorists or Davidists*. Providence, seemed to favor his effort. Letters came to him from all directions urging him to stand firm in this trying hour; to these were added visions and revelations which he fancied he had. Even the persecutions to which his followers were now subjected by the authorities were interpreted by him as a further proof of the divine favor. Was it not gain for them to die? From Holland we see him hasten to Westphalia, and thence back again to his native state to comfort his suffering adherents, and to attend and animate them in their dying hours. Nor did he waver when he saw his own mother led to the scaffold (at Delft, 1537), attesting in her dying hour the doctrines which her son was propagating. The extent of his influence may be inferred from the number who at this time became the subjects of persecution. At Delft thirty-five persons were executed for their adherence to Joris; at Haarlem, Amsterdam, Leyden, Rotterdam, and other cities also many suffered

likewise. In the space of two years more than two hundred betokened their faithfulness to Anabaptist views at the expense of their life. Nor was Joris himself safe from persecution. He was obliged to leave Delft, where he had lived for a while secretly, and, after fleeing from place to place in his native country, he at last quitted Holland. Admonitory letter which he dispatched to the senate of his native land cost the bearer, his head. To return to Holland then became for Joris a hazardous undertaking; he therefore sought a home within the dominions of the landgrave of Hesse, but the latter also refused the weary wanderer a resting place unless he came as a Lutheran. Of course Joris was not now likely to yield up a that his imagination had fancied to be divine truth, and he continued his roving until he felt safe nowhere. Suddenly we meet in Switzerland, in the city of Basle, a person by the name of John of Bruges, the owner of real estate in the town and in the country, a peaceable and good citizen, a communicant in the Reformed Church, who had come to Basle with his family in the spring of 1544. This man was none other than David Joris, the celebrated Anabaptist leader, who, tired of years of wandering, preferred a life of safety and comfort under a fictitious name to a life of celebrity and danger as the leader of a large religious sect. No one ever suspected under the garb of John of Bruges the form of David Joris, and he ended his days peacefully, in the midst of his family, in 1556. By the people of Basle, John of Bruges, alias David Joris, was highly esteemed while he lived among them, for, being a man of wealth, he united magnificence with virtue and integrity. But they thought differently after his death, when his son-in-law, Nicholas Blesdyck, a Reformed preacher in the Palatinate, an avaricious and unprincipled man, charged the deceased with the most blasphemous errors. However much David's family might remonstrate and deny the serious charges, the university and the clergy were called upon to pronounce Joris's opinions as heretical, and his body was ordered to be dug up forthwith and committed to the common hangman to be burned. Thus, strangely enough, the Basle people actually brought to pass what Joris himself had told some of his disciples before his decease, that he would rise again at the end of three years. Respecting the character and opinions of Joris, Mosheim says (*Eccles. Hist.* bk. 4, cent, 16, sec. 3, pt. 2, ch. 3), "He possessed, more sense and more virtue than is commonly supposed, as is evinced not only by his books, of which he published a great many, but also by his disciples, who were persons by no means base, but of great simplicity of manners and character.... In the manner of the more moderate Anabaptists, he labored hard to revive languishing piety

among his fellow men; and in this matter his imagination, which was excessively warm, so deceived him that he falsely supposed he had divine visions; and he placed religion in the exclusion of all eternal objects from the thoughts, and the cultivation of silence, contemplation, and a peculiar and indescribable state of the soul. The Mystics, therefore, of the highest order, and the Quakers, might claim him if they would. and they might assign him no mean rank among their sort of people." He believed that the true word of God is no external letter, but God himself, his word, and his voice in man himself. He opposed the doctrine of the Church concerning the Trinity on the ground that God is impersonal. "Is it not contrary to the manifestations of God in the creature to believe him to be three, and to call all three one?" he asks; and then replies, "God reveals himself in three periods, following each other successively — the periods of faith, hope, and love, all of them headed by a Godman appearing in God's stead." The second commenced with Jesus Christ, but the third and higher period, the period of perfect manhood, was inaugurated with the appearance of David Joris. The true Christ is the spiritual, the eternal word, eternally hid in the Father, the heart and the nature of God. This spiritual Christ has by no means really become flesh, but Jesus took the form of Christ in the flesh to make himself manifest. All that was done on or by Jesus in the body was a shadow (type) of what man will do and suffer in the spirit. Hence also there. was no power for salvation in Christ's external (i.e. bodily) sufferings and death, but we of our own accord must save ourselves by the sufferings and death of our old man. This deeper and more complete revelation is made to the world by David Joris, the true David, the Christ, not by descent in the flesh, but in the Spirit, and not in the spirit of the crucified and deceased, but of the resurrected and living Christ. With Joris's appearance must terminate the announcement of Christ after the flesh. Joris himself is to establish, both. internally and externally, the eternal kingdom of Christ, which hitherto was the kingdom of Christ only internally. He who has reached the perfection of this kingdom [which, of course, could also be done in this world, his *external* kingdom] is freed thereafter from all law, be it human or divine. Evidently Joris's doctrine was nothing but a fully developed system of Montanism (q.v.). He denied the doctrine of future judgment, as he declared that perfection is attained in this world, and thereafter the dependence of the subject on the Creator ceases. Of course he also ruled out of existence angels, both good and bad. He held, with Manes, that the body only, and not the. soul, was defiled by sin; and he

took a most impolitic step when he adopted the principles of the Adamites with respect to marriage.

Of his 250 books and 1000 letters, the most important is his *Book of Miracles*, which appeared at Deventer in 1542, under the title of *Wonderboeck*, etc. (2d ed. 1551, folio). A list of all his writings, and a very elaborate statement of his life and work, were written by Prof. Nippolt, of Heidelberg University, in the *Zeitschrift für hist. Theol.*; 1863, p. 389; 1864, p. 483 sq.; 1868, p. 476 sq. See also Arnold, *Kirchen u. Ketzerhistorie*, pt. 2, bk. 16, ch. 21, § 36. p. 873 sq.; Trechsel, *Protest. Antitrinit.* 1, 36, 55; Escher, in Ersch. und Gruber, *Allem. Encyclop.* 23; 36-47; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation*, 5, 442 sq., 469 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengesch.* 3, 148 sq.; Cramer, in the *Archiv. of Kist en Royaards*, 5, 1 sq.; 6, 291 sq. **SEE ANABAPTISTS.** (J.H.W.)

Jorissen, Matthias,

a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, was born at Wezel, Holland, October 26., 1739, and educated at the University of Utrecht. His first settlement was at Havezathen, whence he was called to Hasselt, and thence, in 1782; to the Hague, to preach to a German congregation. This charge he held up to his death, Jan. 13, 1823. Jorissen's characteristics were clearness and vigor of intellect, warmth of affection, solidity of judgment, and a remarkable talent to read men and things. His native endowments were cultivated by extensive reading, thorough study, and much intercourse with the best society. He was evangelical in sentiment, of eminent personal piety, devoted to the best interests of his flock, and commanded universal esteem and love. He was one of the founders of the Netherlands Missionary Society. A new version of the Psalms in German was prepared by him. To it he added a few hymns. It was welcomed and adopted by German congregations in the Reformed Church of Holland. His other published writings are comparatively few... See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, 1, 186 sq.; *Geschiedeneis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, by A. Ypeij and J. Dermont, 4, 320. (J.P.W.)

Jor'koäm

[some *Jorko'äm*] (Hebrew *Yorkeäm'*, [q̄h̄y]; *paleness of the people*, or perh. *extended people* Sept. Ἰερκαάν v.r. Ἰεκλάν, both confounded with Rekem following; Vulgate *Jercaam*), a person apparently named as the son of Raham, of the descendants of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel, of the

tribe of Judah (~~1~~ 1 Chronicles 2:44); but others (e.g. Gesenius after Jarchi) understand "father" there to mean *founder*, so that this would be the name of a town settled by Raham — an interpretation sustained by a similar use of other names in the same connection. The locality thus alluded to is otherwise unknown, but from the associated places may be presumed to have been a place in the region southeast of Hebron.

Jornandez

(*Jornandes* or *Jordanes*), a celebrated historian of the 6th century, was by birth a Goth, or both of Alan and Gothic descent. After adopting the Christian religion he became a zealous churchman, subsequently entered a monastery, and was finally made bishop of Croton, in Italy. He wrote two historical works in the Latin language, *De Regnorum ac Temporum Successione* — a short compendium of the most important events in history from the Creation down to A.D. 552; valuable from the accounts it contains of several barbarous northern nations — and *De Getarum Origine et Rebus Gestis* (concerning the origin and deeds of the Goths), which has obtained great renown, chiefly from its being our only source of information about the Goths and other barbarian tribes, except when they are casually mentioned by some Greek or Latin historian. The work, which in the main is a compilation of other writers, is full of inaccuracies, both of time, place, and person; Jornandez himself, however, seems to have been aware of the imperfect condition of his works, for he makes no claims to erudition or extended research. The aim of the works is believed to have been first to extol the Gothic nation, and, secondly, to bring about a union of the Goths and the Romans, for he tries to prove that both nations have long been friends and confederates, and that their perpetuation depended upon the most intimate alliance of the two. See Grimm and Krafft, *K. gesch. d. gener. Volker*, 1, 1, 77, etc.; Schmidt's *Zeitschr. J. Geschichtl. Wissenschaft.*, 6, 516 sq.; Sybel. *De fontibus libri Jordanis*, etc. (Berlin, 1838), Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, s.v.

Jortin, Johns, D. D.,

an eminent English divine, was born in London Oct. 23, 1698. His parents were French Huguenots, and formed part of that noble and devoted band who fled from France at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, giving up all in preference to abjuring their faith. He received his grammatical education at the Charter House. In May, 1715, he was admitted to Jesus College, in

Cambridge, of which he became in due time a fellow. He very soon, attracted attention by his remarkable proficiency as a scholar, particularly his mastery of the learned languages, and two years after being admitted to the college was recommended by his tutor, Dr. Styan Thirlby, to make extracts from Eustathius for the use of Pope's Homer, and for his services in the work he received the highest commendations from that distinguished poet. While at Cambridge he published a small volume of poems, which are greatly admired, and allowed by scholars to possess a very high rank among modern Latin verses. In 1723 he was admitted to deacon's orders, and the following June to that of priest. In 1726-27 he was presented to the living of Swavesey, near Cambridge, but, in consequence of his marriage soon after, he resigned that living, and removed to London, where he soon became an admired and popular preacher. When his friend, Dr. Osbaldeston, became bishop of London in 1762, Jortin was appointed his domestic chaplain, and was presented with a prebend in the Church of St. Paul and the living of Kensington. To these was soon added the archdeaconry of London. He fixed his residence at Kensington, where he died in 1770. He was as much beloved for his private virtues as admired for his learning, abilities, liberality of mind, and contempt of subserviency. Few men have ever enjoyed the intimacy of so many eminent persons. Among these may be mentioned the names of bishops Horsley, Warburton, Sherlock, Hare, Lowth, and Secker, besides Cudworth, Middleton, Pope, Akenside, Dr. Samuel Johnson, Dr. Parr, Dr. Doddridge, and others. The most intimate relations subsisted between Dr. Jortin and bishop Warburton until he incurred the displeasure of that distinguished prelate by controverting his doctrine with regard to the state of the dead, as described by Homer and Virgil, in his "Divine Legation of Moses." The critical writings of Dr. Jortin are greatly admired by all who have a taste for curious literature. It is not merely on account of the learning which is displayed in them, and the use which is made of obscure authors, but there is a terseness in the expression, and a light, playful satire in the thoughts, which render them very entertaining. His principal works are, *Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion*, etc. (Lond. 1746, 3 vols. 8vo): — *Life of Erasmus* (Lond. 1758-60, 2 vols. 4to): — *Sermons on different Subjects, and the Doctrine of a Future State*, etc. (Lond. 1771, 4 vols. 8vo): — *Six Dissertations upon different Subjects* (Lond. 1772, 7 vols. 8vo): — *Tracts, philological, critical, and miscellaneous* (Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, ancient and modern* (1731, 2 vols. 8vo): — *On Covetousness* (Tracts of Angl.

Fathers, 4, 226); and *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, a work which is universally allowed to be curious, interesting, and impartial; full of manly sense, acuteness, and profound erudition. — *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, s.v. (E. de P.)

Jos'abad,

a less correct form for

1. JOZABAD *SEE JOZABAD* (q.v.), *a*, ^{<13124>}1 Chronicles 12:4; *b*. (Ἰωζαβδός. v.r. Ἰωσαβδός), 1 Esdr. 8:63; compare ^{<13133>}Ezra 8:33.

2. For ZABDAI (Ἰωζάβδος v.r. Ἰωσάβαδος, Ὠζάβαδος, and Ζαβδός), 1 Esdr. 9:29; comp. ^{<13138>}Ezra 10:28.

Jos'aphat

(Ἰωσαφάτ), a Graecized form (^{<4103>}Matthew 1:8) of the name of JEHOSHAPHAT *SEE JEHOSHAPHAT* (q.v.), king of Judah.

Josaphi'as

(Ἰωσαφάις), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 8:36) of the name JOSIPHIA *SEE JOSIPHIA* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (^{<13130>}Ezra 8:10).

Joscelin

bishop of Soissons, a rival of Abelard, and one of the most distinguished teachers in Paris, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In 1115 he became archdeacon of Soissons, and in 1126 succeeded Lisiard as bishop of that see. He took part in the councils of Troyes and Rouen, and in the coronation of king Philip. In 1131 Innocent II sent him, together with St. Bernard, on a mission to the archbishop and to the count of Bordeaux. On his return in 1132 he founded the abbey of Longpont. In 1140 he was one of the judges of Abelard at the Council of Sens, and at the Council of Paris in 1147 was commissioned to inquire into the propositions attributed to Gilbert de la Porrée. He died Oct. 25, 1152. Joscelin enjoyed great reputation for learning and wisdom, and in his diocese fulfilled all the duties of his charge with scrupulous faithfulness. He wrote an *Expositio symboli* and an *Expositio Orationis Dominice*, both of which were published in Martene and Durand's *Amplissima Collectio*, 9, 1101, 1111, Martene, *Anecdota*, p. 434, gives also two of his letters. See *Gallia Christ.*

9, 357; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 12, 412. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 26, 948. (J.N.P.)

Joscius

(called also JODOCUS, JOSCIONUS, JOSCELINUS, JOSTHO, and GOTHO), a French Roman Catholic prelate, became bishop of St. Brieuc in 1150. In 1157 he was translated to the see of Tours, and immediately began to quarrel with the convents of his diocese, till king Louis VII was obliged to interfere. When Frederick Barbarossa pretended to judge the claims of the rival popes, Victor and Alexander, Joscius was sent to the latter by England and France to assure him of their support and bring him to France. In 1167 Joscius was the prelate who, after the murder of Thomas à Becket, was commissioned by the pope to excommunicate the king of England. It was Joscius also who, when Henry had received absolution in 1172, went to him at Caen, and publicly declared him reconciled to the Church. He died in 1173 or 1174. See *Gallia Christ.* vol. 14, col. 89, 1088. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, 26, 949.

Jo'se

(Ἰωσή, or, rather, Ἰωσή, Gen. of Ἰωσής, *Joses*), the son of Eleazar and father of Er, among the maternal ancestors of Christ, unmentioned in the O.T. (^{<4133>}Luke 3:29). B.C. between 876 and 628. *SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.*

Jos'edec

(Ἰωσεδέκ), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5:5, 48, 56; 6:2; 9:19; Ecclus. 49:12) of Josedech, tile high priest (^{<3700>}Haggai 1:1). *SEE JEHOZADAK.*

Jo'seph

(Heb. *Yoseph'*, *āśēy*, containing, according to ^{<4323>}Genesis 30:23, 24, a two-fold significance [the two Heb. roots coinciding in form in Hiphil], *remover*, from *āśā*; and *increaser*, from *āśj*; the latter favored by the uncontracted or Chaldaistic form *Yehoseph'*, *āśēhy*] occurring only ^{<4805>}Psalm 81:6; Sept. and N.T. Ἰωσήφ, i.q. *Josephus*), the name of several men in the Scriptures and Josephus, all doubtless after the first of the name, whose beautiful history is told at length in the Scriptures with inimitable simplicity. *SEE JOSEPHUS.*

to have been not very far distant, pasturing their flock like the Arabs of the present day, wherever the wild country (ver. 22) was unowned. His appearing in view of his brothers was the signal for their malice to gain head. They began to devise means for his immediate destruction, which they would have unhesitatingly effected but for his half brother Reuben, who, as the eldest son might well be the party to interfere on behalf of Joseph. A compromise was entered into, in virtue of which the youth was stripped of the distinguishing vestments which he owed to his father's affection, and cast into a pit. Having performed this evil deed, and while they were taking refreshment, the brothers beheld a caravan of Arabian merchants (Ishmaelites = Midianites), who were bearing the spices and aromatic gums of India down to the well known and much frequented mart, Egypt. Judah on this feels a better emotion arise in his mind, and proposes that instead of allowing Joseph to perish, they should sell him to the merchants, whose trade obviously from this embraced human beings as well as spicery. Accordingly the unhappy young man was sold for a slave (at the price of twenty shekels of silver, a sort of fixed rate: see ^{<0275>}Leviticus 27:5), to be conveyed by his masters into Egypt. While on his way thither, Reuben returned to the pit, intending to rescue his brother, and convey him safely back to their father. Finding Joseph gone, he returned with expostulations to the wicked young men, who, so far from relenting, now concerted a fresh act of treachery, by which at once to cover their crime and also punish their father for his partiality towards the unoffending sufferer. With this view they dipped Joseph's party colored garment in the blood of a kid and sent it to Jacob in order to make him believe that his favorite child had been torn to pieces by some wild beast. The trick succeeded, and Jacob was grieved beyond measure (^{<0382>}Genesis 38:12-35). B.C. 1895.

2. Meanwhile the merchants sold Joseph to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, and captain of the royal guard, who was a native of the country (^{<0375>}Genesis 37:36). It is by no means easy to determine who at this time was the Pharaoh, or ruling monarch, though, what is far more important, the condition of the country, and therein the progress of civilization, are in certain general and important features made clear in the course of the narration. According to Syncellus, however, the general opinion in his day was that the sovereign's name who ruled Egypt at the time of the deportation of Joseph was Aphophis. *SEE EGYPT*. In Potiphar's house Joseph enjoyed the highest confidence and the largest prosperity. A higher

power watched over him; and whatever he undertook succeeded, till at length his master gave everything into his hands. He was placed over all his master's property with perfect trust, and "the Lord blessed the Egyptian's house for Joseph's sake" (ver. 5). The sculptures and paintings of the ancient Egyptian tombs bring vividly before us the daily life and duties of Joseph. The property of great men is shown to have been managed by scribes, who exercised a most methodical and minute supervision over all the operations of agriculture, gardening, the keeping of livestock, and fishing. Every product was carefully registered to check the dishonesty of the laborers, who in Egypt have always been famous in this respect. Probably in no country was farming ever more systematic. Joseph's previous knowledge of tending flocks, and perhaps of husbandry, and his truthful character, exactly fitted him for the post of overseer.

The Hebrew race have always been remarkable for personal beauty, of which Joseph seems, to have had an unusual share. This fact explains, though, it cannot palliate, the conduct of Potiphar's wife, who, with the well known profligacy of the Egyptian women; tried every means to bring the pure minded youth to fulfill her unchaste desires. Foiled in her evil wishes, she resolved to punish Joseph, who thus a second time innocently brings on himself the vengeance of the ill disposed. Charged with the very crime to which he had in vain been tempted; he is, with a fickleness characteristic of Oriental lords, at once cast into the state prison.

(~~Gen~~ Genesis 39). If the suddenness and magnitude of this and other changes in the lot of Joseph should surprise anyone, the feeling will be mainly owing to his want of acquaintance with the manners and customs of the East, where vicissitudes not less marked and sudden than are those presented in our present history are not uncommon; for those who come into the charmed circle of an Eastern court, especially if they are persons of great energy of character, are subject to the most wonderful alternations of fortune, the slave of today being the vizier of tomorrow, and vice versa.

It must not be supposed, from the lowness of the morals of the Egyptians in practice, that the sin of unfaithfulness in a wife was not ranked among the heaviest vices. The punishment of adulterers was severe, and a moral tale, entitled "*The Two Brothers*" (contained in a papyrus of the 19th dynasty, found in the British Museum, and translated in the *Cambridge Essays* for 1858), is founded upon a case nearly resembling that of Joseph.

It has, indeed, been imagined that this story was based upon the trial of Joseph, and as it was written for the heir to the throne of Egypt at a later period, there is some reason in the idea that the virtue of one who had held so high a position as Joseph might have been in the mind of the writer, were this part of his history well known to the priests, which, however, is not likely. This incident, moreover, is not so remarkable as to justify great stress being laid upon the similarity to it of the main event of a moral tale. The story of Bellerophon might as reasonably be traced to it, were it Egyptian and not Greek. The Muslims have founded upon the history of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, whom they call Yusuf and Zelikha, a famous religious allegory. This is much to be wondered at, as the Koran relates the tempting of Joseph with no material variation in the main particulars from the authentic narrative. The commentators say that, after the death of Potiphar (Kitfir), Joseph married Zelikha (Sale, chap. 12). This mistake was probably caused by the circumstance that Joseph's father-in-law bore the same name as his master.

Potiphar, although believing Joseph guilty, does not appear to have brought him before a tribunal, where the enormity of his alleged crime, especially after the trust placed in him, and the fact of his being a foreigner, which was made much of by his master's wife (^{<0394>}Genesis 39:14, 17), would probably have insured a punishment of the severest kind. He seems to have only cast him into the prison, which appears to have been in his house, or, at least, under his control since afterwards prisoners are related to have been put "in ward. [in] the house of the captain of the executioners, into the prison" (40:3), and simply "in ward [in] the captain of the executioners' house" (^{<0410>}Genesis 41:10; comp. 40:7). The prison is described as "a place where the king's prisoners [were] bound" (^{<0320>}Genesis 39:20). Here the hardest time of Joseph's period of probation began. He was cast into prison on a false accusation, to remain there for at least two years, and perhaps for a much longer time. At first he was treated with severity; this we learn from Psalm 105, "He sent a mail before them, Joseph [who] was sold for a slave: whose feet they afflicted with the fetter: the iron entered into his soul" (ver. 17:18). There is probably here a connection between "fetter" and "iron" (comp. ^{<0408>}Genesis 49:8), in which case the signification of the last clause would be "the iron entered into him," meaning that the fetters cut his feet or legs. This is not inconsistent with the statement in Genesis that the keeper of the prison treated Joseph well (^{<0321>}Genesis 39:21), for we are not justified in thence inferring that he was

kind from the first. In the prison, as in Potiphar's house. Joseph was found worthy of complete trust, and the keeper of the prison placed everything under his control, God's especial blessing attending his honest service. After a while Pharaoh was incensed against two of his officers, "the chief of the cup bearers" (*μυρσῶν ἀρχηγός*), and "the chief of the bakers" (*μυρσῶν ἀρχηγός*), and cast them into the prison where Joseph was. Here the chief of the executioners, doubtless a successor of Potiphar (for, had the latter been convinced of Joseph's innocence, he would not have left him in the prison, and if not so convinced he would not have trusted him), charged Joseph to serve these prisoners. Like Potiphar, they were "officers" of Pharaoh (40:2), and though it may be a mistake to call them grandees, their easy access to the king would give them an importance that explains the care taken of them by the chief of the executioners. Each dreamed a prophetic dream, which Joseph correctly interpreted, disclaiming human skill and acknowledging that interpretations were of God. It is not necessary here to discuss in detail the particulars of this part of Joseph's history, since they do not materially affect the leading events of his life; they are, however, very interesting, from their perfect agreement with the manners of the ancient Egyptians as represented on their monuments. On the authority of Herodotus and others, it was long denied that the vine grew in Egypt; and if so, the imagery of the butler's dream would hardly have been appropriate. Wilkinson, however, has shown beyond a question that vines did grow in Egypt, and thus not only removed a doubt, but given a positive confirmation of the sacred record (*Manners of the Anc. Egypt.* 2, 152).

The butler, whose fate was auspicious, promised the young Hebrew to employ his influence to procure his restoration to the free air of day; but when again in the enjoyment of his "butlership," "he forgat" Joseph (~~Gen~~ Genesis 40). B.C. 1885. Pharaoh himself, however, had two dreams, which found in Joseph a successful expounder; for the butler remembered the skill of his prison companion, and advised his royal master to put it to the test in his own case. Pharaoh's dream, as interpreted by Joseph, foreboded the approach of a seven years' famine; to abate the evils of which Joseph recommended that some "discreet and wise man" should be chosen and set in full power over the land of Egypt. The monarch was alarmed, and called a council of his advisers. The wisdom of Joseph was recognized as of divine origin and supereminent value; and the king and his ministers (whence it appears that the Egyptian monarchy — at Memphis — was not despotic, but constitutional) resolved that Joseph should be made

(to borrow a term from Rome) dictator in the approaching time of need. "And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, Forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art. Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled. only in the throne will I be greater than thou. See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh took off his ring and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had; and they cried before him, Bow the knee. *SEE ABRECI*. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift up his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-paaneah [savior of the world; comp. Jablonsky, *Opusc.* 1, 207.sq.]; and he gave him to wife Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On. And Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt" (41:39 sq.). The monuments show that on the investiture of a high official in Egypt, one of the chief ceremonies was the putting on him a collar of gold (see *Ancient Egyptians*, pl. 80); the other particulars, the vestures of fine linen and the riding in the second chariot, are equally in accordance with the manners of the country. It has been supposed that Joseph was taken into the priestly order, and thus ennobled. The Biblical narrative does not support this opinion, though it leaves it without a doubt that in reality, if not in form as well, the highest trust and the proudest honors of the state were conferred on one so recently a Hebrew slave. The age of Joseph is stated to have been thirty years at the time of this promotion (41:46). B.C. 1883.

3. Seven years of abundance afforded Joseph opportunity to carry into effect such plans as secured an ample provision against the seven years of need. The famine came, but it found a prepared people. The representations of the monuments, which show that the contents of the granaries were accurately noted by the scribes when they were filled, well illustrate this part of the history. *SEE GRANARY*. The visitation was not merely local, for "the famine was over all the face of the earth;" "and all countries came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn" (ver. 56, 57). The expressions here used, however, do not require us to suppose that the famine extended beyond the countries around Egypt, such as Palestine, Syria, and Arabia, as well as some part of Africa, although of course it may have been more widely experienced. It may be observed, that although famines in Egypt depend immediately upon the failure of the inundation, and in other countries upon the failure of rain, yet that, as the rise of the

Nile is caused by heavy rains in Ethiopia, an extremely dry season there and in Palestine would produce the result described in the sacred narrative. It must also be recollected that Egypt was anciently the granary of neighboring countries and that a famine there would cause first scarcity, and then famine, around. Famines are not very unfrequent in the history of Egypt; but the famous seven years' famine in the reign of the Fatimite Caliph El'Mustansir-billah is the only known parallel to that of Joseph. *SEE FAMINE*. Early in the time of famine, Joseph's brethren came to buy corn, a part of the history which we mention here only as indicating the liberal policy of the governor of Egypt, by which the storehouses were opened to all buyers, of whatever nation they were.

After the famine had lasted for a time, apparently two years, there was "no bread in all the land; for the famine [was] very sore, so that the land of Egypt and [all] the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine. And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought; and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house" (⁰¹⁴⁷¹³Genesis 47:13, 14). When all the money of Egypt and Canaan was exhausted, barter became necessary. Joseph then obtained all the cattle of Egypt, and in the next year, all the land, except that of the priests, and apparently, as a consequence, the Egyptians themselves. He demanded, however, only a fifth part of the produce as Pharaoh's right. It has been attempted to trace this enactment of Joseph in the fragments of Egyptian history preserved by profane writers, but the result has not been satisfactory. Even were the latter sources trustworthy as to the early period of Egyptian history, it would be difficult to determine the age referred to, as the actions of at least two kings are ascribed by the Greeks to Sesostriis, the king particularized. Herodotus says that, according to the Egyptians, Sesostriis "made a division of the soil of Egypt among the inhabitants, assigning square plots of ground of equal size to all, and obtaining his chief revenue from the rent which the holders were required to pay him every year" (2, 109). Elsewhere he speaks of the priests as having no expenses, being supported by the property of the temples (2, 37), but he does not assign to Sesostriis, as has been rashly supposed, the exemption from taxation that we may reasonably infer. Diodorus Siculus ascribes the division of Egypt into nomes to Sesostriis, whom he calls Sesosis. Taking into consideration the general character of the information given by Herodotus respecting the history of Egypt at periods remote from his own time, we are not justified in supposing

anything more than that some tradition of an ancient allotment of the soil by the crown among the population was current when he visited the country. The testimony of Diodorus is of far less weight.

There is a notice, in an ancient Egyptian inscription, of a famine which has been supposed to be that of Joseph. The inscription is in a tomb at Beni Hasan, and records of Ameni, a governor of a district of Upper Egypt, that when there were years of famine, his district was supplied with food. This was in the time of Sesertesen 1, of the twelfth dynasty. It has been supposed by Bunsen (*Egypt's Place*, 3, 334) that this must be Joseph's famine; but not only are the particulars of the record inapplicable to that instance, but the calamity it relates was never unusual in Egypt, as its ancient inscriptions and modern history equally testify.

Joseph's policy towards the subjects of Pharaoh is important in reference to forming an estimate of his character. It displays the resolution and breadth of view that mark his whole career. He perceived a great advantage to be gained, and he lost no part of it. He put all Egypt under Pharaoh. First the money, then the cattle, last of all the land, and the Egyptians themselves, became the property of the sovereign, and that, too, by the voluntary act of the people without any pressure. This being effected, he exercised a great act of generosity, and required only a fifth of the produce as a recognition of the rights of the crown. Of the wisdom of this policy there can be no doubt. Its justice can hardly be questioned when it is borne in mind that the Egyptians were not forcibly deprived of their liberties, and that when these had been given up they were at once restored. We do not know all the circumstances; but if, as we may reasonably suppose, the people were warned of the famine, and yet made no preparation during the years of overflowing abundance, the government had a clear claim upon its subjects for having taken precautions they had neglected. In any case it may have been desirable to make a new allotment of land, and to reduce an unequal system of taxation to a simple claim to a fifth of the produce. We have no evidence whether Joseph were in this matter divinely aided, but we cannot doubt that if not he acted in accord with a judgment of great clearness in distinguishing good and evil.

4. We have now to consider the conduct of Joseph at this time towards his brethren and his father. Early in the time of famine, which prevailed equally in Canaan and Egypt, Jacob reproved his helpless sons and sent them to Egypt, where he knew there was corn to be bought. Benjamin alone he

kept with him. Joseph was now governor, an Egyptian in habits and speech, for like all men of large mind he had suffered no scruples of prejudice to make him a stranger to the people he ruled. In his exalted station he labored with the zeal that he showed in all his various charges, presiding himself at the sale of corn. They had, of necessity, to appear before Joseph, whose license for the purchase of corn was indispensable. Joseph had probably expected to see them, and he seems to have formed a deliberate plan of action. His conduct has brought on him the always ready charges of those who would rather impeach than study the Bible, and even friends of that sacred book have hardly in this case done Joseph full justice (Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 2, 366; Heuser, *Diss. non inhumaniter sed prudenttissime Josephum cum fratribus fecisse*, Hal. 1773). Joseph's main object appears to have been to make his brothers feel and recognize their guilt in their conduct towards him. For this purpose suffering, then as well as now, was indispensable. Accordingly, Joseph feigned not to know his brothers, charged them with being spies, threatened them with imprisonment and allowed them to return home to fetch their younger brother, as a proof of their veracity, only on condition that one of them should remain behind in chains, with a prospect of death before him should not their words be verified. Then it was, and not before, that "they said one to another, We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul and would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us. And Reuben said, Spake I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child, and ye would not hear? therefore. behold, also his blood is required" (~~OR21~~ Genesis 42:21). Upon this after weeping bitterly, he by common agreement bound his brother Simeon, and left him in custody. How deeply concerned Joseph was for his family, how true and affectionate a heart he had, may be learned from the words which escape from the brothers in their entreaty that Jacob would allow Benjamin to go into Egypt, as required by Joseph: "The man asked us straitly of our state and of our kindred, saying, Is your father yet alive? have ye another brother?" (~~OR37~~ Genesis 43:7).

At length Jacob consents to Benjamin's going in company with his brothers: "And God Almighty give you mercy before the man, that he may send away your other brother and Benjamin. If I be bereaved of my children, I am bereaved" (ver. 14). Thus provided, with a present consisting of balm, honey, spices, and myrrh, nuts and almonds, and with double money in their hands (double, in order that they might repay the

sum which Joseph had caused to be put into each man's sack at their departure, if, as Jacob supposed, "it was an oversight"), they went again down to Egypt and stood before Joseph (^{<0415>}Genesis 43:15); and there, too, stood Benjamin, Joseph's beloved brother. The required pledge of truthfulness was given. If it is asked why such a pledge was demanded, since the giving of it caused pain to Jacob, the answer may be thus: Joseph knew not how to demean himself towards his family until he ascertained its actual condition. That knowledge he could hardly be certain he had gained from the mere words of men who had spared his life only to sell himself into slavery. How had these wicked men behaved towards his venerable father? His beloved brother Benjamin, was he safe? or had he suffered from their jealousy and malice the worse fate with which he himself had been threatened? Nothing but the sight of Benjamin could answer these questions and resolve these details.

Benjamin had come, and immediately a natural change took place in Joseph's conduct: the brother began to claim his rights in Joseph's bosom. Jacob was safe, and Benjamin was safe. Joseph's heart melted at the sight of Benjamin: "And he said to the ruler of his house, Bring these men home, and slay and make ready, for these men shall dine with me at noon" (^{<0416>}Genesis 43:16). But guilt is always the ready parent of fear; accordingly, the brothers expected nothing but being reduced to slavery. When taken to their own brother's house, they imagined they were being entrapped. A colloquy ensued between them and Joseph's steward, whence it appeared that the money put into their sacks, to which they now attributed their peril, was in truth a present from Joseph, designed, after his own brotherly manner, to aid his family in their actual necessities. The steward said, "Peace be to you; fear not; your God and the God of your father hath given you the treasure in your sacks. I had your money" (ver. 23).

Noon came, and with it Joseph, whose first question regarded home: "He asked them of their welfare, and said, Is your father well, the old man of whom ye spake? is he yet alive? And he lifted up his eyes and saw his brother Benjamin, his mother's son, and said, Is this your younger brother? And he said, God be gracious unto thee, my son!" "And Joseph made haste, for his bowels did yearn upon his brother, and he sought where to weep; and he entered into his chamber, and wept there." Does this look like harshness?

The connection brings into view an Egyptian custom, which is of more than ordinary importance, in consequence of its being adopted in the Jewish polity: "And they set on (food) for him by himself (Joseph), and for them by themselves (the brethren), and for the Egyptians which did eat with them, by themselves: because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination with the Egyptians" (ver. 32). This passage is also interesting, as proving that Joseph had not, in his princely grandeur, become ashamed of his origin, nor consented to receive adoption into a strange nation: he was still a Hebrew, waiting, like Moses after him, for the proper season to use his power for the good of his own people.

Other customs appear in this interesting narrative: "And they (the brothers) sat before him (Joseph), *the first born according to his birthright*, and the youngest according to his youth." "And he sent messes (delicacies) unto them from before him; but Benjamin's mess was five times so much as any of theirs" (ver. 32, 33). Fear had now given place to wonder, and wonder at length issued in joy and mirth (comp. ver. 18, 33, 34). The scenes of the Egyptian tombs show us that it was the custom for each person to eat singly, particularly among the great; that guests were placed according to their right of precedence, and that it was usual to drink freely, men and even women being represented as overpowered with wine, probably as an evidence of the liberality of the entertainer. *SEE BANQUET.*

Joseph, apparently with a view to ascertain how far his brethren were faithful to their father, hit upon a plan which would in its issue serve to show whether they would make any, and what sacrifice, in order to fulfill their solemn promise of restoring Benjamin in safety to Jacob. Accordingly, he orders not only that every man's money (as before) should be put in his sack's mouth, but also that his "silver cup, in which my lord drinketh, and whereby he divineth," should be put in the sack's mouth of the youngest. The brethren leave, but are soon overtaken by Joseph's steward, who charges them with having surreptitiously carried off this costly and highly-valued vessel. They, on their part, vehemently repel the accusation, adding, "with whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die, and we also will be my lord's bondmen." A search is made, and the cup is found in Benjamin's sack. Accordingly they return to the city. And now comes the hour of trial: Would they purchase their own liberation by surrendering Benjamin? After a most touching interview, in which they prove themselves worthy and faithful, Joseph declares himself unable any longer to withstand the appeal of natural affection. On this occasion Judah, who is

the spokesman, shows the deepest regard to his aged father's feelings, and entreats for the liberation of Benjamin even at the price of his own liberty. In the whole of literature we know of nothing more simple, natural, true, and impressive; nor, while passages of this kind stand in the Pentateuch, can we even understand what is meant by terming that collection of writings "the Hebrew national epic," or regarding it as an aggregation of historical legends. If here we have not history, we can in no case be sure that history is before us (^{<0440>}Genesis 44).

Most natural and impressive is the scene also which ensues, in which Joseph, after informing his brethren who he was, and inquiring, first of all, "Is my father alive?" expresses feelings free from the slightest taint of revenge, and even shows how, under divine Providence the conduct of his brothers had issued in good — "God sent me before you to preserve a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance." Five years had yet to ensue in which "there would be neither earning nor harvest," and therefore the brethren were directed to return home and bring Jacob down to Egypt with all speed. "And he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck and wept; and Benjamin wept upon his neck. Moreover, he kissed all his brethren and wept upon them; and after that his brethren talked with him" (^{<0454>}Genesis 45:14, 15).

The news of these striking events was carried to Pharaoh, who, being pleased at Joseph's conduct, gave directions that Jacob and his family should come forthwith into Egypt: "I will give you the good of the land of Egypt, and ye shall eat the fat of the land; regard not your stuff, for the good of all the land is yours." The brethren departed, being well provided for: "And to his father Joseph sent ten asses laden with the good things of Egypt, and ten she asses laden with corn, and bread, and meat for his father by the way." The intelligence which they bore to their father was of such a nature that "Jacob's heart fainted, for he believed them not." When, however, he had recovered from the thus naturally told effects of his surprise, the venerable patriarch said, "Enough; Joseph, my son, is yet alive: I will go and see him before I die" (^{<0455>}Genesis 45:26, 28). Accordingly Jacob and his family, to the number of threescore and ten souls, go down to Egypt, and by the express efforts of Joseph, are allowed to settle in the district of Goshen, where Joseph met his father: "And he fell on his neck, and wept on his neck a good while." There Joseph "nourished his father and his brethren, and all his father's household, with bread, according to their families" (^{<0472>}Genesis 47:12). B.C. 1874.

5. Joseph had now to pass through the mournful scenes which attend on the death and burial of a father (^{<0000>}Genesis 1:1-21). B.C. 1856. Having had Jacob embalmed, and seen the rites of mourning fully observed, the faithful and affectionate son — leave being obtained of the monarch — proceeded into the land of Canaan, in order, agreeably to a promise which the patriarch had exacted (^{<0473>}Genesis 47:29-31), to lay the old man's bones with those of his fathers, in "the field of Ephron the Hittite." Having performed with long and bitter mourning Jacob's funeral rites, Joseph returned into Egypt. The last recorded act of his life forms a most becoming close. After the death of their father, his brethren, unable, like all guilty people, to forget their criminality, and characteristically finding it difficult to think that Joseph had really forgiven them, grew afraid, now they were in his power, that he would take an opportunity of inflicting some punishment on them. They accordingly go into his presence, and in imploring terms and an abject manner entreat his forgiveness. "Fear not" this is his noble reply — "I will nourish you and your little ones."

6. By his Egyptian wife Asenath, daughter of the high priest of Heliopolis, Joseph had two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim (^{<0405>}Genesis 42:50 sq.), whom Jacob adopted (^{<0405>}Genesis 48:5), and who accordingly took their place among the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel.

Picture for Joseph

Joseph lived a hundred and ten years, kind and gentle in his affections to the last; for we are told, "The children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, were brought up upon Joseph's knees" (^{<0523>}Genesis 50:23). Having obtained a promise from his brethren that when the time came, as he assured them it would come, that God should visit them, and "bring them unto the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," they would carry up his bones out of Egypt, Joseph at length "died, and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin" (^{<0526>}Genesis 50:26). B.C. 1802. This promise was religiously fulfilled. His descendants, after carrying the corpse about with them in their wanderings, at length put it in its final resting place in Shechem, in a parcel of ground that Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor, which became the inheritance of the children of Joseph (^{<0242>}Joshua 24:32). A tomb which probably represents the same spot is still shown to travelers in the vicinity of Jacob's Well (Hackett's *Illustrations*, p. 197). It is a flat roofed rectangular building surmounted by a dome, under

which is pointed out the real tomb, in shape like a covered wagon (Wilson, *Bible Lands*, 2, 60).

The history of Joseph's posterity is given in the articles devoted to the tribes of EPHRAIM and MANASSEH. Sometimes these tribes are spoken of under the name of Joseph (^{<0640>}Joshua 14:4; 17:14, 17; 18:5; ^{<0023>}Judges 1:23, 35, etc.), which is even given to the whole Israelitish nation (^{<380E>}Psalms 80:1; 81:5; ^{<3155>}Amos 5:15; 6:6). Ephraim is, however, the common name of his descendants, for the division of Manasseh gave almost the whole political weight to the brother tribe (^{<1987>}Psalms 78:67; ^{<2576>}Ezekiel 37:16, 19; ^{<3006>}Zechariah 10:6). That great people seems to have inherited all Joseph's ability with one of his goodness, and the very knowledge of his power in Egypt, instead of stimulating his offspring to follow in his steps, appears only to have constantly drawn them into a hankering after that forbidden land which began when Jeroboam introduced the calves, and ended only when a treasonable alliance laid Samaria in ruins and sent the ten tribes into captivity.

7. The character of Joseph is wholly composed of great materials, and therefore needs not to be minutely portrayed. We trace in it very little of that balance of good and evil, of strength and weakness, that marks most things human, and do not anywhere distinctly discover the results of the conflict of motives that generally occasions such great difficulty in judging men's actions. We have as full an account of Joseph as of Abraham and Jacob, a fuller one than of Isaac; and if we compare their histories, Joseph's character is the least marked by wrong or indecision. His first quality seems to have been the greatest resolution. He not only believed faithfully, but could endure patiently, and could command equally his good and evil passions. Hence his strong sense of duty, his zealous work, his strict justice, his clear discrimination of good and evil. Like all men of vigorous character, he loved power, but when he had gained it he used it with the greatest generosity. He seems to have striven to get men unconditionally in his power that he might be the means of good to them. Generosity in conferring benefits, as well as in forgiving injuries, is one of his distinguishing characteristics. With this strength was united the deepest tenderness. He was easily moved to tears, even weeping at the first sight of his brethren after they had sold him. His love for his father and Benjamin was not enfeebled by years of separation, nor by his great station. The wise man was still the same as the true youth. These great qualities explain his power of governing and administering, and his extraordinary flexibility,

which enabled him to suit himself to each new position in life. The last trait to make up this great character was modesty, the natural result of the others.

In the history of the chosen race Joseph occupies a very high place as an instrument of Providence. He was "sent before" his people, as he himself knew, to preserve them in the terrible famine, and to settle them where they could multiply and prosper in the interval before the iniquity of the Canaanites was full. In the latter days of Joseph's life, he is the leading character among the Hebrews. He makes his father come into Egypt, and directs the settlement. He protects his kinsmen. Dying, he reminds them of the promise, charging them to take his bones with them. Blessed with many revelations, he is throughout a God taught leader of his people. In the N.T. Joseph is only mentioned; yet the striking particulars of the persecution and sale by his brethren, his resisting temptation, his great degradation and — yet greater exaltation, the saving of his people by his hand, and the confounding of his enemies, seem to indicate that he was a type of our Lord. He also connects the patriarchal with the Gospel dispensation, as an instance of the exercise of some of the highest Christian virtues under the less distinct manifestation of the divine will granted to the fathers.

8. For further discussion of the events of Joseph's history, see Wolfenb. *Fragment*. p. 36; Less, *Geschichte der Rel.* 1, 267; J.T. Jacobi, *Sämmtl. Schrift.* part 3; Hess, *Gesch. der Patriarch.* 2, 324; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 2, 340; *Allgem. Welthist.* 2, 332; Heeren, *Ideen*, 2, 551; Jablonski, *Opusc.* 1, 207, Gesenius, *Thes. Hebr.* p. 1181; Hammer, *D. Osman. Reich.* 2, 83 Hengstenberg, *Mos. und Lqg.* p. 30; J.B. Burcardi, in the *Ius. Helv.* 1, 3, 355; Voigt, in the *Brem. und verd. Biblioth.* 5, 599; Bauer, *Heb. Gesch.* 1, 181; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 1, 464; Doderlein, *Theol Biblioth.* 4, 717; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* 3, 310; Lengerke, *Kendan*, 1, 263; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 331; Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* 2, 332; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.*; Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*; Stanley, *Hist. of the Jewish Church*; Adamson, *Joseph and his Brethren* (Lond. 1844); Edelman, *Sermons on the Hist. of Joseph* (Lond. 1839); Leighton, *Lectures on Hist. of J.* (Lond. 1848); Plumptre, *Hist. of Joseph* (Lond. 1848); Randall, *Lectures on Hist. of J.* (Lond. 1852); Wardlaw, *Hist. of Joseph* (new ed. Lond. 1851); Gibson, *Lectures on 11ist. of J.* (Lond. 1853); Overton, *Lectures on Life of Joseph* (London. 1866). Treatises on special points are the following: Hoppe, *De philosophia Josephi* (Helmst. 1706); *A Review of the Life and Administration of Joseph* (London, 1743); J.B. Burckhard, *De criminibus*

Josepho inpactis (Basil. 1746); Ansaldus, *Josephi religio vindicata* (Brix. 1747); Triglalid, *De Josepho adorato* (L.B. 1750); Winkler, *Unters. einiger Schwierigk. vom Jos.* (in his *Schriftsteller*, 3, 1); Heuser, *De non inhumaniter Josephumfticisse* (Halle, 1773); Kuchler, *Quare Josephus patrent non de se certiozem fecerit* (Leucop. 1798); Nicolai, *De servis Josephi Medicis* (Helmst. 1752); Piderib, *De nomine Josephi in AEgypto* (Marb. 1768-9); Reineccius, *De nomine j n[p tnp̄x* (Weissenf. 1725); Schröder, *De Josephi laudibus* (in Schonfeld's *Vita Jacobi*. Marb. 1713); Von Seelen, *De Josepho Egyptiorum rectore* (Lub. 1742); T. Smith, *Hist. of Joseph in connection with Eg. Antiquities* (Lond. 1858); Walter, *De Josepho lapide Israelis* (Hersf. 1734); Wunschald, *De cognomin Josephi Agyptiaco* (Wittenb. 1669). **SEE JACOB.**

- 2.** The father of Igal, which latter was the Issacharite "spy" to explore Canaan (^{<4137>}Numbers 13:7). B.C. ante 1657.
- 3.** The second named of the sons of Asaph, appointed head of the first division of sacred musicians by David (^{<137>}1 Chronicles 25:2, 9). B.C. 1014.
- 4.** The son of Jonan, and father of Judah or Adaiah, among Christ's maternal ancestors, but unmentioned in the O.T. (^{<133>}Luke 3:30). B.C. ante 876.
- 5.** Son of Shebaniah, and one of the chief priests contemporary with Jehoiakim (^{<1214>}Nehemiah 12:14). B.C. post 536.
- 6.** One of the "sons" of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (^{<1502>}Ezra 10:42). B.C. 459.
- 7.** The son of Judah, and father of Semei, maternal ancestors of Jesus (^{<135>}Luke 3:26); probably the same with SCHECHANIAH, the son of Obadiah, and father of Shemaiah (^{<132>}1 Chronicles 3:21, 92). B.C. between 536 and 410.
- 8.** The son of Mattathiah, and father of Janna, maternal ancestors of Christ, unmentioned in the Old Test. (^{<134>}Luke 3:24). B.C. considerably post 406. See on this and Nos. 4 and 7, **SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.**
- 9.** (Ἰωσήφ.) Son of Oziel, and father of On, an ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1).

- 10.** A young man of high character, son of Tobias, and nephew of the Jewish high priest Onias II, whose avarice he rebuked. but prevented its evil consequences by propitiating Ptolemy, and becoming the collector of his taxes. His history is given at considerable length by Josephus (*Ant.* 12, 4, 2 10), including his unintentional marriage with his own niece, by whom he had a son named Hyrcanus.
- 11.** (Ἰώσηφος.) Son of Zacharias, left with Azarias as general of the Jewish troops by Judas Maccabaeus, and defeated by Gorgias, B.C. cir. 164 (1 Macc. 5, 8, 56 60; Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 8, 6).
- 12.** (Ἰώσηπος.) In 2 Macc. 8:22; 10:19. Joseph is named among, the brethren of Judas Maccabaeus apparently in place of JOHN (Ewald, *Gesch.* 4:384, note; Grimm, *ad* 2 Macc. 8:22). The confusion of Ἰωάννης, Ἰωσήφ, Ἰωσής is well seen in the various readings in ^{<405>}Matthew 13:55. *SEE JOSES.*
- 13.** Uncle of Herod the Great, who left him in charge when he went to plead his cause before Antony, with injunctions to put Mariarne to death in case he never returned; but this order, being disclosed to Mariarne, led to Joseph's death by command of Herod through suspicion of criminal intercourse with Marianne (Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 5, 6, 9). He had married Salome, Herod's sister (*War*, 1, 22, 4). He seems to be the same elsewhere called Herod's treasurer (ταμίαις, *Ant.* 15, 6, 5).
- 14.** Son of Antipater, and brother of Herod the Great (Josephus, *War*, 1, 8, 9), was sent by the latter with a large force to subdue the Idumaeans (*Ant.* 14:15,4), and afterwards left by him in Jerusalem with full powers to act on the defensive against Macheras, neglecting which orders he lost his life in an engagement near Jericho (*War*, 1, 17, 1-4). He also had a son named Joseph (*Ant.* 18, 5, 4), who seems to be the one mentioned as cousin (ἀνεψιός.) of Archelaus (*War*, 2, 5, 2).
- 15.** Son of Ellemus, a relative of the high priest Matthias, in whose place he officiated for a single day (apparently that of the annual atonement), in consequence of the accidental disqualification of the pontiff (Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 6, 4).
- 16.** The foster father of our Savior, being "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ" (^{<4016>}Matthew 1:16). By Matthew he is said to have been the son of Jacob, whose lineage is traced by the same

writer through David up to Abraham. Luke represents him as being the son of Heli, and traces his origin up to Adam. Luke appears to have had some specific object in view, since he introduces his genealogical line with words of peculiar import: "Jesus being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli" (^{<4123>}Luke 3:23) — ὡς ἐνομίζετο, "as was supposed," in other terms, as accounted by law, as enrolled in the family registers; for Joseph being the husband of Mary, became thereby, in law (νόμος), the father of Jesus. *SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST*. He lived at Nazareth, in Galilee (^{<4114>}Luke 2:4), and it is probable that his family had been settled there for some time, since Mary lived there too (^{<4115>}Luke 1:26, 27).

The statements of Holy Writ in regard to Joseph are few and simple. According to a custom among the Jews, traces of which are still found, such as hand fasting among the Scotch, and betrothing among the Germans, Joseph had pledged his faith to Mary; but before the marriage was consummated she proved to be with child. Grieved at this, Joseph was disposed to break off the connection; but, not wishing to make a public example of one whom he loved, he contemplated a private disruption of their bond. From this step, however, he is deterred by a heavenly messenger, who assures him that Mary has conceived under a divine influence. "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins" (^{<4018>}Matthew 1:18 sq.; ^{<4027>}Luke 1:27). It must have been within a very short time of his taking her to his home that the decree went forth from Augustus Caesar which obliged him to leave Nazareth with his wife and go to Bethlehem. He was there with Mary and her firstborn when the shepherds came to see the babe in the manger, and he went with them to the Temple to present the infant according to the law, and there heard the prophetic words of Simeon as he held him in his arms. When the wise men from the East came to Bethlehem to worship Christ, Joseph was there; and he went down to Egypt with them by night, when warned by an angel of the danger which threatened them; and on a second message he returned with them to the land of Israel, intending to reside at Bethlehem, the city of David; but, being afraid of Archelaus, he took up his abode, as before his marriage, at Nazareth, where he carried on his trade as a carpenter. When Jesus was twelve years old Joseph and Mary took him with them to keep the Passover at Jerusalem, and when they returned to Nazareth he continued to act as a father to the child Jesus, and was always reputed to be so indeed.

Joseph was by trade a carpenter, in which business he probably educated Jesus (Thilo, *Apocr.* 1, 311). In ^{<4035>}Matthew 13:55, we read, "Is not this the son of the carpenter?" and in ^{<4003>}Mark 6:3, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" The term employed, τέκτων, is of a general character, and may be fitly rendered by the English word *artificer* or *artizan*, signifying any one that labors in the *fabrication* (*jaber* in Latin) of articles of ordinary use, whatever the material may be out of which they are made. **SEE CARPENTER.** Schleusner (in voc.) asserts that the universal testimony of the ancient Church represents our Lord as being a carpenter's son. This is, indeed, the statement of Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryphone*, § 88), for he explains the term τέκτων, which he applies to Jesus, by saying that he made ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά, *ploughs and yokes*; but Origen, in replying to Celsus, who indulged in jokes against the humble employment of our Lord, expressly denied that Jesus was so termed in the Gospels (see the passage cited in Otho's *Justin Martyr*, 2, 306, Jenoe, 1843) — a declaration which suggests the idea that the copies which Origen read differed from our own; while Hilarius, on Matthew (quoted in Simon's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 1, 691), asserts, in terms which cannot be mistaken, that Jesus was a smith (*ferrum igne vincentis, massamque formantis, etc.*). Among the ancient Jews all handicrafts were held in so much honor that they were learned and pursued by the first men of the nation. **SEE ARTIFICER.**

Jewish tradition (*Hieros. Shaph.* c. 14) names the father of Jesus ἀρυδνρ, *Pendira*, or *Penthira* (αρϋτνρ, *Midrash, Kohel*, 10, 5; Πάνθηρ, Thilo, *Apocr.* 1, 528), and represents him (Orig. c. *Cels.* 1, 32) as a rough soldier, who became the father of Jesus after Mary was betrothed to Joseph. Another form of the legend sets him forth (*Toled. Jeshu*, p. 3, ed. Wagenseil; comp. Epiphan. *Hoer.* 78, 7) under the name of *Joseph Pandera* (ἄσϋϋ αρδνρ). Christian tradition makes Joseph an old man when first espoused to Mary (Epiphan. *Hoer.* 78, 7), being no less than eighty years of age, and father of four sons and two daughters. Theophylact. on ^{<4035>}Matthew 13:55, says that Jesus Christ had brothers and sisters, all children of Joseph, whom he had by his sister-in-law, wife of his brother Cleophas, who having died without issue, Joseph was obliged by law to marry his widow. Of the sons, James, the brother of the Lord, was, he states, the first bishop of Jerusalem. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 2, 1) agrees in substance with Theophylact; so also does Epiphanius, adding that Joseph was fourscore years old when he married Mary. Jerome, from

whom it appears that the alleged mother's name was Escha, opposes this tradition, and is of opinion that what are termed the brothers of Jesus were really his cousins. *SEE JAMES*; *SEE MARY*. The painters of Christian antiquity conspire with the writers in representing Joseph as an old man at the period of the birth of our Lord — an evidence which is not to be lightly rejected, though the precise age mentioned may be but an approximation to fact. Another account (Niceph. 2, 3) gives the name of Salome as that of Joseph's first wife, who was related to the family of John the Baptist. The origin of all the earliest stories and assertions of the fathers concerning Joseph, as, e.g., his extreme old age, his having sons by a former wife, his having the custody of Mary given to him by lot, and so on, is to be found in the apocryphal Gospels, of which the earliest is the Protevangelium of St. James, apparently the work of a Christian Jew of the 2d century, quoted by Origen, and referred to by Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr (Tischendorf. *Proleg.* 13). The same stories are repeated in the other apocryphal Gospels. The Monophysite Coptic Christians are said to have first assigned a festival to St. Joseph in the Calendar, viz., on the 20th of July, which is thus inscribed in a Coptic Almanac: "Requies sancti senis justi Josephi fabri lignarii, Deiparae Virginis Mariae sponsi, qui pater Christi vocari promeruit." The apocryphal *Historia Josephi fabri lignarii*, which now exists in Arabic (ed. Walling, Lips. 1722; in Latin by Fabricius, *Pseudepigr.* 1, 300; also by Thilo and Tischendorf), is thought by Tischendorf to have been originally written in Coptic, and the festival of Joseph is supposed to have been transferred to the Western churches from the East as late as the year 1399. The above named history is acknowledged to be quite fabulous, though it belongs probably to the 4th century. It professes to be an account given by our Lord himself to the apostles on the Mount of Olives, and placed by them in the library of Jerusalem. It ascribes 111 years to Joseph's life, and makes him old, and the father of four sons *and* two daughters before he espoused Mary. It is headed with this sentence: "Benedictiones ejus et preces servant nos omnes, o fratres. Amen." The reader who wishes to know the opinion of the ancients on the obscure subject of Joseph's marriage may consult Jerome's acrimonious tract *Contra Helvidium*. He will see that Jerome highly disapproves the common opinion (derived from the apocryphal Gospels) of Joseph being twice married, and that he claims the authority of Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, and "many other apostolical men," in favor of his own view, that our Lord's brethren were his cousins only, or, at all events, against the opinion of Helvidius, which had been

held by Ebion, Theodotus of Byzantium, and Valentine, that they were the children of Joseph and Mary. Those who held this opinion were called *Antidicomarianitoe*, as enemies of the Virgin. (Epiphanius, *Adv. Hoeres.* l. 3, t. 2; *Hoeres.* 78, also *Hoer.* 41. See also Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. Virgin Mary; Mill, *On the Brethren of the Lord*; Calmet, *De St. Joseph. St. Mar. Virg. conjuge*; and, for an able statement of the opposite view, Alford's note on ^{<1035>}Matthew 13:55.) **SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.**

It is not easy to determine when Joseph died. That event may have taken place before Jesus entered on his public ministry. This has been argued from the fact that his mother only appeared at the feast at Cana in Galilee. The premises, however, hardly bear out the inference. With more force of argument, it has been alleged (Simon, *Dict. de la Bible*) that Joseph must have been dead before the crucifixion of Jesus, else he would in all probability have appeared with Mary at the cross. Certainly the absence of Joseph from the public life of Christ, and the failure of reference to him in the discourses and history, while "Mary" and "his brethren" not unfrequently appear, afford evidence not only of Joseph's death, but of the inferior part which, as the legal father only of our Lord, Joseph might have been expected to sustain. So far as our scanty materials enable us to form an opinion, Joseph appears to have been a good, kind, simple-minded man, who, while he afforded aid in protecting and sustaining the family, would leave Mary unrestrained to use all the impressive and formative influence of her gentle, affectionate, pious, and thoughtful soul. B.C. cir. 45 to A.D. cir. 25.

Further discussion of the above points may be seen in Meyer, *Num Jos. tempore nativ. C. fuerit senex decrepitus* (Lips. 1762); comp. Reay, *Narratio de Jos. e s. codice desumpta* (Oxon. 1823); Walther, *Dass Jos. d. wahre Vater Christi sei* (Berlin, 1791); Oertel, *Antijosephismus* (1792); Hasse, *Jos. verum Jesu paters non fuisse* (Regiom. 1792); Ludewig, *Hist. Krit. Unters.* (Wolferb. 1831). The traditions respecting Joseph are collected in *Act. Sanct.* 3, 4 sq.; there is a Life of Joseph written in Italian by Affaitati (Mail. 1716). See also Volbeding, *Index*, p. 8; Hase, *Leben Jesu* (4th ed. 1854), p. 56. **SEE JESUS CHRIST.**

17. Surnamed **CAIAPHAS** **SEE CAIAPHAS** (q.v.), Jewish high priest in the time of our Lord's ministry.

18. A native (not resident, as in Michaelis, *Begräbniss- und Auferstehungsgesch. Christi*, p. 44) of Arimathaea (^{<1075>}Matthew 27:57, 59;

^{<415B>}Mark 15:43, 45; ^{<2281>}Luke 23:50; ^{<619B>}John 19:38), a city, probably the Ramah of the O.T., in the territory of Benjamin, on the mountain range of Ephraim, at no great distance south of Jerusalem (^{<6825>}Joshua 18:25; ^{<0015>}Judges 4:5), not far from Gibeah (^{<07913>}Judges 19:13; ^{<210D>}Isaiah 10:29; ^{<285B>}Hosea 5:8). *SEE ARIMATHEA.*

Joseph was a secret disciple of Jesus — "an honorable counsellor (**βουλευτης**), who waited for the kingdom of God" (^{<415B>}Mark 15:43), and who, on learning the death of our Lord, "came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus." Pilate, having learned from the centurion who commanded at the execution that Jesus was actually dead, gave the body to Joseph, who took it down and wrapped his deceased Lord in fine linen which he had purchased for the purpose; after which he laid the corpse in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone against the door of the sepulchre (^{<415B>}Mark 15:43 sq.). From the parallel passages in ^{<4278>}Matthew 27:58 sq., ^{<2281>}Luke 23:50 sq., and ^{<619B>}John 19:38 sq., it appears that the body was previously embalmed at the cost of another secret disciple, Nicodemus, and that the sepulchre was new, "wherein never man before was laid" (thus fulfilling ^{<281D>}Isaiah 53:9); also that it lay in a garden, and was the property of Joseph himself (comp. Origen, *c. Cels.* 2, p. 103, ed. Spenc.; Walch, *Observ. in Matthew ex inscript.* p. 84). This garden was "in the place where Jesus was crucified." A.D. 29. *SEE GOLGOTHA.* Luke describes the character of Joseph as "a good man and a just," adding that "he had not assented to the counsel and deed of them," i.e. of the Jewish authorities. From this remark it is clear that Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrim: a conclusion which is corroborated by the epithet "counsellor," applied to him by both Luke and Mark. Whether Joseph was a priest, as Lightfoot (*Hor. Iseb.* p. 669) thought, there is not evidence to determine. Various opinions as to his social condition may be found in Thiess (*Krit. Comment.* 2, 149). Tradition represents Joseph as having been one of the Seventy (Ittig, *Diss. de Pat. Apostol.* § 13; Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* 3, 1, 319 sq.); and that Joseph, being sent to Great Britain by the apostle Philip about the year 63, settled with his brother disciples at Glastonbury, in Somersetshire, and there erected of wicker twigs the first Christian oratory in England, the parent of the majestic abbey which was afterwards founded on the same site. The local guides to this day show the miraculous thorn (said to bud and blossom every Christmas day) that sprung from the staff which Joseph stuck in the ground as he stopped to rest himself on the hill top. (See

Dugdale's *Monasticon*, 1, 1; and Hearne, *Hist. and Antiq. of Glastonbury*). Other traditional notices May be seen in the *Evang. Nicod.* c. 12 sq.; *Acta sanctor.* Mart. 2, 507 sq.; comp. the dissertations *De Josepho Arimath* of Bromel [Teutzell] (Viteb. 1683) and Björnland (Aboa, 1729). **SEE JESUS CHRIST.**

19. Surnamed BARSABAS **SEE BARSABAS** (q.v.), one of the two persons whom the primitive Church, immediately after the resurrection of Christ, nominated, praying that the Holy Spirit would show which of them should enter the apostolic band in place of the wretched Judas. On the lots being cast, it proved that not Joseph, but Matthias, was chosen (~~401B~~ Acts 1:23). A.D. 29.

Joseph also bore the honorable surname of *Justus* (q.v.), which was not improbably given him on account of his well known probity. He was one of those who had "compained with the apostles all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptism of John," until the ascension (~~401B~~ Acts 1:15 sq.). Tradition also accounted him one of the Seventy (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 12). The same historian relates (3, 39), on the authority of Papias, that Joseph the Just "drank deadly poison, and by the grace of God sustained no harm." It has been maintained that he is the same as Joses, surnamed Barnabas, mentioned in ~~403B~~ Acts 4:36; but the manner in which the latter is characterized seems to point to a different person (Heinrichs, *On Acts*, 1:23; Ullmann, in the *Theolog. Stud. u. Kritik.* 1, 377; Alynster, *ibid.* 1829, 2, 326). He is also to be distinguished from Judas Barsabas (~~415D~~ Acts 15:22).

20. Son of Camus or Camydus, appointed Jewish high priest in place of Cantheras by Herod, brother of Agrippa I, who had obtained temporary control over the Temple from Claudius Caesar during the presidency of Longinus and the procuratorship of Fadus, A.D. 46. 8 (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 1,3). He was removed by the same authority in favor of Ananias, son of Nebadaeus, during the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander, A.D. 48 (*ib.* 5, 2).

21. Surnamed *Cabi*, son of Simon, a former high priest of the Jews, and himself appointed to that office by Agrippa during the procuratorship of Festus (A.D. 62), but shortly afterwards removed by the same authority on the arrival of Albinus (A.D. 62), in favor of Ananus, son of Ananus (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 8, 11; 9, 1). **SEE HIGH PRIEST.**

- 22.** Son of a female physician (ἰατρὶνῆ), who excited a sedition at Gamala near the close of the Jewish independence (Josephus, *Life*, 37).
- 23.** Son of Daleeus, an eminent Jew, who threw himself into the flames of the Temple rather than surrender to the Romans (Josephus, *War*, 6, 5, 1).

Joseph, Patriarch Of Constantinople

from A.D. 1416 to 1439, is one of the distinguished characters in the history of the Council of Florence. He was for a long time one of the most radical opponents to a union of the Eastern and Western churches, but the cunning Romanists at last ensnared the hoary patriarch, and he was induced, at a time when Rome itself was divided, to throw his influence in favor of the politic Eugenius IV, and actually attended the Council of Florence, there and then argued for union, and finally signed articles of agreement to effect this end. No sooner, however, had he assented than deep remorse for his action, forced upon him mainly by the unfortunate condition of his country, then greatly harassed by the invading Turks, brought him to a sick bed, and he died eight days after signing the instrument, June 10, 1439, leaving the Greek emperor, John Palaeologus, the only support of the Greek Council. See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, 8, 13 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* book 3, cent. 15, pt. 2, ch. 2, § 13, 23, note 57. For further details, see the articles *SEE BASLE, COUNCIL OF*; *SEE FLORENCE, COUNCILS OF*; *SEE GREEK CHURCH.* (J.H.W.)

Joseph (St.) The Hymnologist

(*Josephus hymnographus*, a native of Sicily, fled from that island to Africa and then to Greece. He entered a convent at Thessalonica, where he became eminent for his ascetic practices, and for the fluency and gracefulness of his utterance, "so that he easily," says his biographer, "threw the fabled sirens into the shade." Having been ordained presbyter, he went to Constantinople with Gregory of Decapolis, who there became one of the leaders of the "orthodox" party in their struggle with the iconoclastic emperor, Leo the Armenian, which began in A.D. 814. From Constantinople Joseph repaired, at the desire of this Gregory, to Rome, to solicit the support of the pope, but, falling into the hands of pirates, was by them carried away to Crete. Here he remained till the death of Leo the Armenian (A.D. 820), when he was, as his biographer asserts, miraculously delivered, and conveyed to Constantinople. On his return he found his friend and leader Gregory dead, and attached himself to another leader,

John, on whose death he caused his body, together with that of Gregory, to be transferred to the deserted church of St. John Chrysostom, in connection with which he established a monastery, that was soon, by the attractiveness of his eloquence, filled with inmates. After this he was, for his strenuous defense of image worship, banished to Chersonae, apparently by the emperor Theophilus, who reigned from A.D. 829 to 842; but, on the death of the emperor, was recalled from exile by the empress Theodora, and obtained, through the favor of the patriarch Ignatius, the office of scenophylax, or keeper of the sacred vessels in the great church of Constantinople. Joseph was equally acceptable to Ignatius and to his competitor and successor Photius. He died at an advanced age in A.D. 883. Joseph is chiefly celebrated as a writer of canones or hymni, of which several are extant in MS., but there is some difficulty in distinguishing his compositions from those of Joseph of Thessalonica. His *Canones in omnia Beatoe Virginis Marioe festa*, and his *Theotocia*, hymns in honor of the Virgin, scattered through the ecclesiastical books of the Greeks were published, with a learned commentary and a life of Joseph, translated from the Greek of John the Deacon, by Hippolito Maracci, under the title of *Mariale S. Josephi Hymnographi* (Rome, 1661). The version of the life of Joseph was by Luigi Maracci, of Lucea, the brother of Ippolito. Another Latin version of the same life, but less exact, by the Jesuit Floritus, was published among the *Vitae Sanctorum Soecolorum* of Octavius Cajetanus (Ottavio Gaetano), 2, 43 (Palermo. 1657, folio), and reprinted in the *Acta Sanctorum* (see below). Some writers suppose that there was another Joseph, a writer of hymns, mentioned in the title of a MS. typicon at Rome as of the monastery of St. Nicolaus Casularum (τῶν Κασούλων). See *Vita S. Josephi Hymnographi*, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, s. d. 3 Aprilis, 2, 269, etc., with the commentary of Praevius of Papebroche, and Appendix, p. 24; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11, 79; *Menologium Groecorum*, jussu Basilii, Imperatoris editum, s.d. 3 Aprilis (Urbino, 1727, folio). — Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 3, 929.

Joseph ben-Chija

(in the Talmud simply styled *Rabbi Joseph*), one of the greatest of Israel's Rabbis, was born in Babylon about A.D. 270. Rabbi Joseph was a disciple of Jehudah ben-Jecheskel, the founder and president of the college at Pumbadita, and a fellow student and intimate lifelong friend of the celebrated Rabba ben-Nachmani, commonly called Rabba, the reputed author of *the Midrash Rabba*, or the traditional commentary on Genesis,

whom he succeeded in the presidency at Pumbedita about A.D. 330. He died, however, only three years after (about A.D. 333). Joseph deserves our notice not so much from his connection with the school at Pumbedita, which, though brief, was yet of marked benefit to the development of Biblical scholarship at that center of Jewish learning, as for his Chaldee versions of the Hebrew Scriptures (i.e. the Psalms, Proverbs, and Job), particularly of the Hagiographa, of which alone the authorship can be ascribed to him with any certainty (comp. the Rabbinic Bibles). Some Jewish critics credit him with a version of the whole O. Test.; and, indeed, from passages quoted in the Talmud (comp. *Moed Kafon*, 26. a; *Pesachim*, 68, a; *Menachoth*, 110, a; *Jama*, 32, b; 77, b; *Aboda Sara*, 44, a; *Kiddushin*, 13, a; 72, b; *Nedarim*, 38, a; *Baba Kanma*, 3, b; *Berachoth*, 28, a) from a paraphrase with which he is accredited, it would appear that he translated Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hoses, Amos, Obadiah, Zephaniah, and Zechariah, since these passages, are from these books, and are distinctly cited with the declaration *āswy brūgytmdk*, "as R. Joseph has rendered it into Chaldee." These renderings are, however, almost exactly those given in the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel (a fact which has led some to suppose that this Targum ascribed to Jonathan is in reality Joseph's); and he himself even declared on several occasions, when discussing the meaning of a difficult passage in the Scriptures, "If we had not the Targum on this passage we should not know what it means" (see *Sanhedrim*, 94, a; *Moed Katon*, 28, b; *Megilla*, 3, a). It is therefore unreasonable to suppose him to have himself actually rendered into Chaldee more than the Hagiographa contained (with a Latin version) in the Polyglots of Antwerp (1572), Paris (1645), London (1657), etc. In his day, Joseph b.-Chija must have enjoyed a very enviable reputation for erudition. His knowledge of traditional lore is said to have been so extensive that he was surnamed, both in Palestine and Babylon, Joseph of Sinai, i.e. one acquainted with all the traditions in succession since the giving of the law on Sinai (*Horajoth*, 14, a; *Sanhedrim*, 42, a). One of his favorite studies was the Cabalistic Theosophy, the mysteries of which, being contained in the vision of Ezekiel respecting the throne of God (*hbkr̄m ḥç[m]*), he endeavored to propound (*Chagiga*, 18, a). See Bartolocci, *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica*, 3, 814; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebroea*, 2, 1171 sq.; Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 65, etc.; Fürst, *Kultur und Literaturgesch. der Juden in Asien*, p. 144-155; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 4, 408 sq., 553 sq.; Ersch u. Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopaedie*, sec. 2,

vol. 31, p. 75; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 165 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v.

Joseph ben-Gikatilla.

SEE MOSES (HA-KOHEN) BEN-SAMUEL.

Joseph ben-Gorion

(also called *Josippon*), is the name of the reputed author of the celebrated Hebrew chronicle *ʿ/ḥpysāʿ rḥpse* the book of *Josippon*, or *yrḥāʿ bē ʿ/ḥpysāʿ*, the Hebrew *Josippon*, a work which, by the statement of the author, is placed in the sera of Christ, for he says of himself that he is "the priest of Jerusalem" (and this can refer only to the celebrated Jewish historian Flavius Josephus [q.v.]), and furthermore that he was appointed governor of the whole Jewish nation by Titus; and from the days of Saadia (A.D. 950) up to our own time it was quoted both by Jewish and Christian writers as a genuine work of Josephus. Of late, however, critical inquiry has determined the work to be a production of the Middle Ages. The conjecture is that the author was a Jew, and that he flourished about the 9th or 10th century. Zunz, in the *Zeitschrift. f. Wissenschaft. d. Judenth.* (Berl. 1822, p. 300 sq.), asserted that Joseph ben-Gorion flourished in the 9th century, and that his work must since his day have undergone frequent emendations and alterations. Later Zunz (in his notes on Benjamin of Tudela, ed. Asher, 1841, 2, 246) changed his opinion somewhat, and regarded Joseph as "*the [Hebrew] translator and editor of Josephus,*" and assigns him to "the middle of the latter half of the 10th century," and says of him that his accounts of several nations of his time are as important as his orthography of Italian towns is remarkable." To the same period Steinschneider (*Jewish Liter.*, London, 1857, p. 77) also assigns the work, but he believes the author to have been a native of Northern Italy, and considers the chronicle "the Hebrew edition of the Latin Hegeisippus," and "an offshoot from the fully developed Midrash of Arabian and Latin literature." A still more modern critic, the celebrated Jewish historian Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, 5, 281, and note 4 in the Appendix of the same volume), holds that the Jewish book, which he also assigns to the 10th century, is simply a translation of an Arabic book of Maccabees, entitled *History of the Maccabees of Joseph ben-Gorion* (of which parts were published in the Polyglots, Paris, 1645; Lend. 1657) under the title of the Arabic book of Maccabees, and which is extant in two MSS. in the Bodleian library (*Uri*

Catalogue, Nos. 782, 829), made by a skilful Italian Jew, who enriched it with many original additions. His reason for assigning it to the earlier part of the 10th century is that Danash b.-Tanaim (who flourished about 955) knew the work and spoke of parts of it (comp. Milman's Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 2, 6, note).

But as to the chronicle itself. It consists of six books. It begins its record with Adam; explains the genealogical table in ~~GEN~~Genesis 11; then passes on to the history of Rome, Babylon, Cyrus, and the fall of Babylon; resumes again the history of the Jews; describes the times of Daniel, Zerubbabel, Esther, etc.; gives an account of Alexander the Great, his connection, his exploits, and expeditions of his successors; and then continues the history of the Jews; of Heliodorus's assault on the Temple; the translation of the O.T. into Greek; the deeds of the Maccabees; the events of the Herodians; and the last war which terminated in the destruction of the Temple by Titus. The authorities quoted in this remarkable book are:

1. Nicolaus the Damascene;
2. Strabo of Cappadocia;
3. Titus Livius;
4. Togthas of Jerusalem;
5. Porophius of Rome;
6. The history of Alexander, written in the year of his death by Magi;
7. The book of the antediluvian patriarch Cainan b.-Enos;
8. Books of the Greeks, Medians, Persians, and Macedonians;
9. Epistle of Alexander to Aristotle about the wonders of India;
10. Treaties of alliance of the Romans;
11. Cicero, who was in the Holy of Holies of the Temple during the reign of Pompey;
12. The intercalary years of Julius Caesar, composed for the Nazarites and Greeks;
13. The chronicles of the Roman emperors;
14. The constitutional diploma which Vespasian venerated so highly that he kissed every page of it;
15. The Alexandrian Library with its 995 volumes;
16. Jewish histories which are lost; and,
17. The national traditions which have been translated orally.

The first printed edition of this work appeared in Mantua, 1476-1479, with a preface by Abraham ben-Salmon Conato. A reprint of this edition (the text vitiated), with a Latin version by Münster, was published at Basle, 1541. There appeared an edition from a MS. containing a somewhat different version of the work, and divided into ninety-seven chapters, edited by Tam Ibn-Jachja ben-David (Constantinople, 1510). New editions of it were published in Venice, 1544; Cracow, 1589; Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1689; Amsterdam, 1723; Prague, 1784; Zolkiew, 1805; Vilna, 1819. It was partly translated into Arabic by Zechariah ben-Said el-Temeni about 1223, and into English by Peter Morwyng (Lond. 1558, 1561, 1575, 1579, 1602). There are two other Latin translations, besides the one by Münster, 1541; one was made by the learned English Orientalist, John Gagnier (Oxford, 1716), and one by Breithaupt; the last has also the Hebrew text and elaborate notes, and will always continue to be the student's edition. There are German translations by Michael Adam (Zurich, 1546), Moses b.-Bezaliel (Prague, 1607), Abraham ben-Mordecai Cohen (Amsterdam, 1661), and Seligmann Reis (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1707). Compare, besides the authorities already cited, Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832), p. 146-154; Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie* (Leipzig, 1836), p. 37-40; Carmoly in Jost's *Annalen* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1839), 1. 149 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, 3, 131; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 2, 111-114; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Uebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, 1547-1552; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclopoedia*, s.v.

Joseph ben-Isaac Kimchi.

SEE KIZCHI.

Joseph ben-Satia.

SEE SAADIA.

Joseph ben-Shemtob

a noted Jewish philosopher, polemic, and commentator, flourished in the middle of the 15th century in Castile, and was in high office at the court of Juan II. He was especially noted in his day as a philosopher, and wrote many philosophical works which form important contributions to the history of Jewish philosophy. He was especially rigid in defense of Judaism as a religious system, in opposition to the Christian, and in that line freely

used Profiat Duran's writings, upon which he commented. *SEE PROFIAT*. In his later days he lost his position at court through the machinations of the papists and the so called converts from Judaism, and finally died the death of martyrdom about, 1460. His works of especial interest to us are:

- (1) *Commentary on the celebrated Epistle of Profiat Duran against Christianity* (Constantinople, 1577); contained also in Geiger's, [yj wkyw /bwq](#) (Breslau, 1844): —
- (2) *Course of Homilies* delivered in the synagogue on different Sabbaths on various portions of the Bible, entitled [arwqh ^y\[](#), *The Eye of the Reader* (still in MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, Codex Michael, 581): —
- (3) *Commentary on Lamentations*, composed at Medina del Campo in the year 1441 (MS. by De Rossi, No. 177): —
- (4) *Commentary on Genesis 1:1-6:8*, being the Sabbatic lesson which commences the Jewish year *SEE HAPHTARAH*: — and
- (5) *Exposition of* ^{<651>}Deuteronomy 15:11. Comp. Steinschneider, in Ersch und Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklop.* sec. 2, vol. 31, p. 87-93; *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1529; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8:179 sq.; also note 4 in the Appendix; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v.

Joseph, Joel.

SEE WITZENHAUSEN.

Joseph Taitatzak.

SEE TAITATZAK.

Jose'phus

([Ἰώσηφος](#) v.r. [Φόσηπος](#)), the Graeco-Latin form (1 Esdr. 9:34) of the Heb. name JOSEPH *SEE JOSEPH* (q.v.) [6](#) (^{<150>}Ezra 10:42).

Josephus, Flavius,

the celebrated Jewish historian, was born at Jerusalem A.D. 37. His father's name was Mattathias, and in his autobiography (the only source left us to write his history, as the works of his rival, Justus of Tiberias, are unhappily

lost) he lays claim to royal and sacerdotal lineage, and alludes to the renown he enjoyed while yet a youth (*Life*, 1, 1). His early years seem to have been spent in close study of the Jewish traditions and the O.T. writings. Dissatisfied with all of the three principal Jewish sects, while yet a young man he spent three years as the follower of one Banus, an eremite, in the desert, but at last joined the sect of the Pharisees. He was only 19 when he left Banus, and he joined the Pharisees between 19 and 26, when he went to Rome. Soon afterwards, the imprisonment of some Jewish priests by the procurator Felix afforded him an opportunity of pleading his people's cause before the emperor himself at the Roman capital, whither these men had been sent. On the way he was shipwrecked (some have unwarrantably imagined that he was Paul's companion in that disastrous voyage), but, being rescued by a Cyrenian vessel, he made his way to Rome. He there not only secured the object of his mission, but also ingratiated himself in the favor of the empress, and at length returned home loaded with presents. He found the mass of his countrymen determined on a revolt from the empire, and he anxiously sought to dissuade them from so rash a course. The Jews, however, refused to listen to his advice; and the only alternatives for him were either to follow the popular will, and thus perhaps make himself the leader of his people, or to return to Rome, and there receive the rewards of treachery. In his description of the Jewish insurrection he has given us a graphic account of the numerous plots and perils in which he became entangled during this period of his life. After the disastrous retreat of Cestius Gallus from Jerusalem. and the barbarous massacre of the Jews at Sepphoris (q.v.) and the Syrian cities, the most peacefully inclined of the Jews joined the zealots, and Josephus no longer hesitated as to the best course to be pursued. With great ostentation of patriotism and self devotion, he declared in favor of war "*a outrage*," and he soon secured for himself the appointment as general. Together with Joazar and Judas he was sent to Galilee, "the province on which the storm would first break." His two colleagues, however, devoted themselves to their priestly functions, and Josephus became the sole commander (*Life*, 4-7; *War*, 2, 20, 4). Finding the Galilean Jews divided among themselves, **SEE JOHN OF GISCHALA**, and fearing that his command was too weak to meet the army of the approaching Vespasian, he retired to the Jewish stronghold Jotapata, and there awaited the attack of the Romans. For forty-seven days. he encouraged his soldiers to deeds that immortalized his name. (For an interesting description of this siege, see Weber and Holtzmann, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, 2, 475 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*

[Middleton's edition], 2, 252 sq.) Yet some writers, among them Raphall and Grätz, accuse him even here of treachery and cowardice, alleging that he endeavored to get away from Jotapata on the pretence of desiring to raise an army for its relief, although he could not have left "without either falling into the hands of the Romans or *voluntarily joining them.*" Even after the fall of that fortress he did not surrender to the Romans, but hid himself with forty companions in a cave, and refused to come forth, when his place of refuge was betrayed, until his life was guaranteed him. (See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* 2, 611, col. 1; Raphall, *Post-Bibl. Hist. Jews*, p. 427 sq.) After his surrender to Vespasian he was put in chains, with a view to being sent to Rome for trial before Nero. He evaded this danger by predicting (he distinctly claims the gift of prophecy, *War*, 3, 8, 9) to Vespasian his future elevation to the imperial throne, but was still held in confinement for three years, until, on the realization of his prediction, his chains were *cut* from him, as a sign that he had been unjustly bound (*War*, 4, 10, 7). Vespasian had been declared emperor by the Roman soldiers in the East, and he immediately set out for the West, leaving Titus in command, with orders to hasten the conclusion of the war still raging in Palestine. In this expedition on Jerusalem Josephus accompanied Titus. Titus had supposed this task, with the assistance of the "renegade" (so Milman calls him), an easy one; but the Jews braved the attack of the Romans much more obstinately than the latter had expected, and, finally, Josephus was induced to go forth and urge his countrymen to capitulate, and thus to save the place from certain and total destruction. The people, by his account, were touched and ready to yield, but the leaders remained obstinate; but the fact is that they were naturally disinclined to listen to the counsels of a man who had quitted them in the hour of their greatest need. They even sought to kill him, and continued the defense to the last extremity. On the downfall of the city, the most intimate friends and relatives, of Josephus were spared at his request, and, in return for his aid and counsel in the siege, a valuable estate in Judaea was assigned him as a residence. Well aware, however, that among his countrymen he would hardly find a safe refuge, he returned with Titus to Rome to enjoy the honors which Vespasian might bestow upon him. He was received with great kindness by the emperor; but, although the privileges of Roman citizenship were conferred upon him and an annual pension awarded him, he was detested by the Romans no less than by the Jews. It is supposed that his death occurred in the early years of Trajan's reign, perhaps A.D. 103. For other facts of a more directly personal

character, such as his three marriages, the names of his sons, etc., see the seventy-six chapters of his life, and the following other passages of his other works: *Apion*, 1, 9, 10; *War*, 1; 2, 20, 3 sq.; 21, 2 sq.; 3, 7, 13 sq.; 8, 1 sq.; 9; 6:5; *Ant.* ed. Havercamp, 1, 5, 228, 536, 545, 682, 982; Suidas, s.v. **Ἰώσηπος**.

The character of Josephus has been very differently delineated by different writers. From his own works, especially his books against Apion, it is evident that, though he dealt rather treacherously with his people, he yet felt a pride in the antiquity of the nation and in its ancient glories; and in the description of the misfortunes of the Jews he is by no means wanting in sympathy for them. Thus his account of the miserable fate of Jerusalem is altogether free from that tone of revolting coldness which shocks us in Xenophon's account of the downfall of Athens (*Hell.* 2, 2, § 3 sq.). Yet the mildest interpretation that his conduct can receive certainly is that he despaired (as earnest patriots never do) of his country, and that he deserted his countrymen in their greatest extremity. Indeed, from the very beginning, he appears to have looked on the national cause as hopeless, and to have cherished the intention of making peace with Rome whenever he could. Thus he told some of the chief men of Tiberias that he was well aware of the invincibility of the Romans, though he thought it safer to dissemble his conviction; and he advised them to do the same, and to wait for a convenient *season* — **περιμένουσι καιρόν** (*Life*, 35; compare *War*, 3, 5); and we find him again, in his attack on Justus the historian (*Life*, 65), earnestly defending himself from the charge of having in any way caused the war with Rome. Had this feeling originated in a religious conviction that the Jewish nation had forfeited God's favor, the case, of course, would have been different; but such a spirit of living, practical faith we do not discover in Josephus. Holding in the main the abstract doctrines of a Pharisee, but with the principles and temper of a Herodian, he strove to accommodate his religion to heathen tastes and prejudices; and this by actual commissions (Ottius, *Protermissa a Josepho*, appended to his *Spicilegium*), no less than by a rationalistic system of modification (Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog.* 2, 612). A more favorable opinion is sometimes expressed of Josephus, as by a writer in the *Evangelical Quart. Review*, 1870, p. 420. Prof. F.W. Farrar (in Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Literature*, s.v.) has perhaps best summed up the religious character of Josephus as that of "a strange mixture of the bigoted Pharisee and the time serving

Herodian," and as "mingling the national pride of the patriot with the apostasy of a traitor."

Very different is the opinion of all on the writings of Josephus. Even in his day he was greatly lauded for his literary abilities. Though a Jew by birth, he had so ably acquired the Greek that he could be counted among the classic writers in that language. St. Jerome designates him as the "Graecus Livius" (*Epist. ad Eustach.*); and, to come nearer our own days, Niebuhr pronounces him a Greek writer of singular purity (*Anc. Hist.* 3, 455). But, withal, he is hardly deserving of the epithet. **φιλαλήθης**, so often bestowed on him (Suid. s.v. **Ἰώσηπος**; Isidor Pelusiot. 4, *Ep.* 75: "diligentissimus et **φιλαληθέστατος**," Jos. Scaliger, *De Emend. Temp. Proef.*, etc.). It is true, he understood the duty and importance of veracity in the historian (*Ant.* 14, 1, 1; *War.* 1, 1; *c. Apion*, 1, 19); nevertheless, "he is," says Niebuhr (*Lect. Rom. Hist.* 1. c.), "often untrue, and his archaeology abounds in distortions of historical facts, and in falsifications which arise from his inordinate national pride; and wherever he deals in numbers, he shows his Oriental love of exaggeration" (this charge is, in a measure, refuted, however, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 48). But, even though Josephus may not in all things be implicitly relied upon, his writings are to the theologian especially invaluable, and we may well say, with Casaubon and Farrar, that it is by a singular providence that his works, which throw such a flood of light on Jewish affairs, have been preserved to us. They are of immense service in the entire Biblical department, as may be seen from the frequent references that have been made to his writings throughout this Cyclopaedia, in the elucidation of the history, geography, and archaeology of Scripture. Yet by this it must by no means be inferred that we detract in the least from our former statement, that Josephus was not a man who believed in the inspiration of the Biblical writings. "In spite of his constant assertions (*Ant.* 10, 11)," says Farrar (in Kitto), "he can have had no real respect for the writings which he so largely illustrates. If he had felt, as a Jew, any deep or religious appreciation of the O.T. history, which he professes to follow (**οὐδὲν προθεῖς οὐθ' αὐ παραλιπών**, *Ant.* 1, *procem.*), he would not have tampered with it as he does, mixing it with pseudo-philosophical fancies (*Apion*, 1, 10), with groundless Jewish *Hagadcoth* or traditions (such as the three years' war of Moses with the Ethiopians, the love of Tharbis for him, etc. *Ant.* 2, 10, 2), and with quotations from heathen writers of *very doubtful* authority (*Ant.* 8, 5, 3, etc.; see Van Dale, *De Aristeia*, p. 211). The worst charge, however,

against him is his constant attempt, by alterations and suppressions (and especially by a rationalistic method of dealing with miracles, which contrasts strangely with his credulous fancies), to make Jewish history palatable to Greeks and Romans, to such an extent that J. Ludolfus calls him 'fabulator saepius quam historicus' (*Hist. Ethiop.* p. 230). Thus he omits all the most important Messianic prophecies; he manipulates the book of Daniel in a most unsatisfactory manner (*Ant.* 9, 11); he speaks in a very loose way about Moses and Abraham (*Ant.* 1, 8, 1; *Apion*, 2, 15); and, though he can swallow the romance of the pseudo-Aristeas, he rationalizes the account of the Exodus and Jonah's whale (*Ant.* 2, 16, 5; 9, 10, 2)." On the whole subject of his credibility as a writer, his omissions, his variations, and his panderings to Gentile taste, comp. J.A. Fabricius, *De Joseph. et ejus Scriptu*, in Hudson's ed.; Van Dale, *De Aistecd*, 10, 11; *De Idololatria*, 7; Brinch, *Examen list. Flav. Josephi*, in Havercamp, 2, 309 sq.; Ottius, *Spicilegium ex Josepho*; Ittigius, *Prolegomena*; Usher, *Epist. ad Lud. Cappelluin*, p. 42; Whiston's *Dissertations*, etc.

Of still greater interest, perhaps to our readers must be the relation which Josephus, living as he did in the age of Christ himself, sustained towards Christianity. Some have gone so far as to assert not only the authenticity of passages in his writings alluding to Christ, etc. (see below), but have even made out of Josephus an Ebionite Christian (Whiston, *Dissert.* 1). if not a true follower of Jesus the Christ. Prof. Farrar (in Kitto), speaking on this point, says: "Nothing is more certain than that Josephus was no Christian (ἀπιστῶν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὡς Χριστῷ, Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 35); the whole tone of his mind was alien from the noble simplicity of Christian belief, and, as we have seen already, he was not even a good Jew. Whatever, therefore, may be thought about the passages alluding to John the Baptist (*Ant.* 18, 5, 2), and James, the Lord's brother (*ibid.* 20, 9, 1), which may possibly be genuine, there can be no reasonable doubt that the famous allusion to Christ (*Ant.* 18, 3, 3) is either absolutely spurious or largely interpolated. The silence [partial or total] of Josephus on a subject of such importance, and with which he must have been so thoroughly acquainted, is easily explicable; and it is intrinsically much more probable that he should have passed over the subject altogether (as is done also by his contemporary, Justus of Tiberias, Phot. *Cod. Bibl.* 33) than that he should only have devoted to it a few utterly inadequate lines. Even if he had been induced to do this by some vague hope of getting something by it from Christians like Flavius Clemens, he certainly would not have expressed himself in

language so strong (εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆ), and still less would he have vouched for the Messiahship, the miracles, or the resurrection of Jesus. Justin, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Origen, and even Photius, knew nothing of the passage, nor does it appear till the time of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 1, 2, *Den. Evang.* 3, 5), a man for whom Niebuhr can find no better name than 'a detestable falsifier,' and one whose historical credibility is well nigh given up. Whether Eusebius forged it himself or borrowed it from the *marginalia* of some Christian reader cannot be determined, but that Josephus did not write it [at least in its present form] may be regarded as settled. Nay, the very next sentence (*Ant.* 17, 3, 4) is a disgusting story, wholly irrelevant to the tenor of the narrative, and introduced in all probability for the sole purpose of a blasphemous parody on the miraculous conception, such as was attempted by various Rabbinical writers (e.g. in the *Sepher Toledoth Jeshua*; see Wagenseil, *Tela Ignea Satanae*; **SEE JESUS CHRIST**). That Josephus intended obliquely to discredit some of the chief Christian doctrines by representing them as having been anticipated by the Essenes seems by no means improbable (comp. De Quincey's *Works*, vol. 9, *The Essenes*)." For a compendium of the abundant literature on these questions, see Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* sec. 34. The chief treatises are, Daubuz, *Pro testimonio Fl. Jos. de Jesu Christ* (London, 1706); reprinted in Havercamp; Bohmert, *Ueber des Fl. Jos. Zeugniß von Christo* (Lpz. 1823); Le Moynes, *Var. Sacr.* 2, 931 Heineken, *Excurs.* 1, *ad Euseb. H.E.* 3, 331; comp. also Langen, *Judenthum in Palastina* (Freib. 1866), p. 440 sq.; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1856, 840 sq.

It remains for us only to add a list of the *works of Josephus* (here we mainly follow Smith [*Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.]), which are,

1. *A History of the Jewish War*, (περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου ἢ Ἰουδαικῆς ἱστορίας περὶ ἀλώσεως), in seven books. Josephus tells us that he wrote it first in his own language (the Syro-Chaldee), and then translated it into Greek, for the information of European readers (*War*, 1, 1). The original is no longer extant. The Greek was published about A.D. 75, under the patronage and with the especial recommendation of Titus. Agrippa II, also, in no fewer than sixty-two letters to Josephus, bore testimony to the care and fidelity displayed in it. It was admitted into the Palatine library, and its author was honored with a statue at Rome. It commences with the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 170; runs rapidly over the events before Josephus's own time, and gives a detailed account of the fatal war with Rome (Josephus, *Life*, p. 65;

Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 9; Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccl.* p. 13; Ittigius, *Prolegomena*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Groec.* 5, 4; Vossius, *De Hist. Groec.* p. 239, ed. Westermann): —

2. *Jewish Antiquities* (Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία), in twenty books, completed about A.D. 93, and addressed to Epaphroditus. The title, as well as the number of books, may have been suggested by the Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The work extends from the creation of the world to A.D. 66, the 12th year of Nero, in which the Jews were goaded to rebellion by Gessius Florus. It embraces, therefore, but more in detail, much of the matter of the first and second books on the *Jewish War*. Both these histories are said to have been translated into Hebrew, of which version, however, there are no traces, though some have erroneously identified it with the works of the PseudoJosephus. **SEE JOSEPH BEN-GORION:** —

3. His *Life*, in one book. This is an autobiography appended to the *Antiquities*, and is addressed to the same Epaphroditus. It cannot, however, have been written earlier than A.D. 97, since Agrippa II is mentioned in it as no longer living (65): —

4. *Κατὰ Ἀπίωνος* (a treatise *against Apion*), in two books, also addressed to Epaphroditus. It is in answer to such as impugned the antiquity of the Jewish nation on the ground of the silence of Greek writers respecting it. The title, "against Apion," is rather a misnomer, and is applicable only to a portion of the second book (1-13). It exhibits considerable learning, and is highly commended by Jerome. The Greek text is deficient at 2:5-9: —

5. *The Fourth of Maccabees* (εἰς Μακκαβαίους, ἢ περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ), in one book. The genuineness of this treatise has been called in question by many (see Cave, *Hist. Lit. Script. Eccles.* p. 22), but it is attributed to Josephus by Eusebius, Jerome, Philostorgius, and others (see Fabricius, *Bibl. Groec.* 5, 7; Ittigius, *Prolegomena*). Certainly, however, it does not read like his works. It is an extremely declamatory account of the martyrdom of Eleazar (an aged priest), and of seven youths and their mother, in the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes; and this is prefaced by a discussion on the supremacy which reason possesses *de jure* over pleasure and pain. Its title has reference to the zeal for God's law displayed by the sufferers in the spirit of the Maccabees. There is a paraphrase of it by Erasmus, and in some Greek copies of the Bible it was inserted as the

fourth book of the Maccabees (Fabricius, 1. c.). There are, besides these, also attributed to him: —

6. The treatise *Περὶ τοῦ παντός*, which was certainly not written by Josephus. For an account of it, see Photius, *Cod.* 48; Fabricius, *Bibl. Grec.* 5, 8; Ittigius, *Prolegomena*, ad fin.

7. Jerome (*Proef. ad Lib.* 11 *Comm. ad Esaiam*) speaks of a work of one Josephus on Daniel's vision of the seventy weeks, but he probably refers to some other Josephus: —

8. At the end of his *Antiquities* Josephus mentions his intention of writing a work in four books on the Jewish notions of God and his essence, and on the rationale of the Mosaic laws. but this task he never accomplished. At any rate, the works have not come down to us. (See Whistolo's note, *Ant.* ad fin.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Grec.* 5, 9.)

The writings of Josephus first appeared in print in a Latin translation, with no notice of the place or date of publication: the edition seems to have contained only a portion of the *Antiquities*. These, with the seven books of the Jewish War, were reprinted by Schusler (Augsb. 1470) in Latin; and there were many editions in the same language of the whole works, and of portions of them, before the editio princeps of the Greek text appeared at Basel, 1544, edited by Arlenius. Since then the works of Josephus have frequently been printed, both in the Greek and in many other languages. One of the most valuable editions is that by Hudson (Oxf. 1720, 2 vols. fol.). The text is founded on a most careful and extensive collation of MSS., and the edition is further enriched by notes and indices. The principal English versions are those of Lodge (Lond. 1602); one from the French of D'Andilly (Oxford, 1676, reprinted at London, 1683); that of L'Estrange (Lond. 1702), and that of Whiston (London, 1737). The two last mentioned versions have frequently been reprinted in various shapes. See, besides the authorities already noticed, Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, 3, 399 sq.; Weber and Holtzmann, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* 2, 467 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 1, 225, 319, 444; De Wette, *Hebr. jud. Archaologie*, p. 9; Ewald, *Gesch. Christus* (1855), p. 104 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*. vol. 2 (see Index in vol. 3); Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 2, 117 sq. (J.H.W.)

Jo'ses

(Ἰωσήϛ, perhaps for *Joseph*, which is sometimes thus written in the Talmud, *yséy* for *āséy*; see Lightfoot on ^{<4023>}Acts 1:23; and, indeed, Ἰωσήφ actually appears in some codices for Ἰωσήϛ in Matthew, ^{<4150>}Mark 15, and Acts; but better MSS. have Ἰωάννης in ^{<4130>}Matthew 13; others have Ἰησοῦς in Luke), the name of two or three persons in the New Testament.

1. Erroneously in the A.V. (^{<4019>}Luke 3:29) JOSE *SEE JOSE* (q.v.).
2. The son of Mary and Cleopas, and brother of James the Less, of Simon, and of Jude, and, consequently, one of those who are called "the brethren" of our Lord (^{<4035>}Matthew 13:55; 27:56; ^{<4003>}Mark 6:3; 15:40, 47). *SEE JAMES; SEE JUDE*. He was the only one of these brethren who was not an apostle – a circumstance which has given occasion to some unsatisfactory conjecture. It is, perhaps, more remarkable that three of them were apostles than that the fourth was not. A.D. 28. — Kitto. *SEE JESUS CHRIST*.
3. (^{<4065>}Acts 4:36.) *SEE BARNABAS*.

Jo'shah

(Heb. *Yoshah'*, *hvy/y*, prob. *establisher*; Sept. Ἰωσίας, v.r. Ἰωσία; Vulg. *Josa*), son of Amaziah, and one of the chief Simeonites. the increase of whose family induced them to migrate to the valley of Gedor, whence they expelled the aboriginal Hamites (^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 4:34). B.C. cir. 711.

Josh'aphat

(^{<1314>}1 Chronicles 11:43). *SEE JEHOSHAPHAT*, 1.

Joshavi'ah

(Heb. *Yoshavyah'*, *hyw/y/y*, *Jehovah is sufficient*, otherwise i.q. *Josibiah*; Sept. Ἰωσία; Vulg. *Josaja*), son of Elnaam, and (with his brother Jeribai) one of David's famous bodyguard (^{<1314>}1 Chronicles 11:46). B.C. 1046.

Joshbek'ashah

(Heb. *Yoshbekashah'*, *hνqB]y*; prob. for *hνqB]bvy*, *seat in hardness*; Sept. *Σεβακαϊτάν* and *Ἰεσβακατάν* v.r. *Ἰεσβασακά*; Vulg. *Jesbacas. sa*), one of the sons of Heman, and leader of the seventeenth division of Temple musicians (^{<1324>}1 Chronicles 25:424). B.C. 1014.

Jo'sheb-bas'sebeth

(Heb. *Yosheb'-bash-She'beth*, *t bCBi bvy* *sitting in the session, i.e. council*; Sept. *Ἰεβοσθέ*; Vulg. *sedens in cathedra*; Auth. Vers. "that sat in the seat"), the chief of David's three principal heroes (^{<1038>}2 Samuel 23:8); called in the parallel passage (^{<1311>}1 Chronicles 11:11) *JASHOBEAM* *SEE JASHOBEAM* (q.v.).

Josh'ua

(Heb. *Yehoshu'a*, [*Wv/hyæ* *Jehovah is his help, or Jehovah the Savior*, according to Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. 2, p. 89, ed. 1843; Sept., N.T., and Josephus *Ἰησοῦς*; Auth. Vers. "Jehoshua" in ^{<0436>}Numbers 13:16, and "Jehoshuah" in ^{<1077>}1 Chronicles 7:27; "Jesus" in ^{<4075>}Acts 7:45; ^{<3048>}Hebrews 4:8, *SEE JESHUA*; *SEE JESUS*), the name of several men.

I. The son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim, the assistant and successor of Moses, whose history is chiefly contained in the book that bears his name. His name was originally HOSHEA ([*véh*, *salvation*, ^{<0438>}Numbers 13:8), and it seems that the subsequent alteration of it by Moses (^{<0436>}Numbers 13:16) was significant, and proceeded on the same principle as that of Abram into Abraham (^{<0175>}Genesis 17:5), and of Sarai into Sarah (^{<0175>}Genesis 17:15). In ^{<4687>}Nehemiah 8:17, he is called by the equivalent name JESHUA ([*Wvye* *salvation*). *SEE JESUS*.

1. *Personal History.* — According to the *Tsemach David*, Joshua was born in Egypt, in the year of the Jewish era 2406 (B.C. 1037); but as he was probably about the age of Caleb, with whom he was associated, we may assign his birth to B.C. cir. 1698 (or, as below, 1693). The future captain of invading hosts grew up a slave in the brick fields of Egypt. Born about the time when Moses fled into Midian, he was a man of some forty years when he saw the ten plagues and shared in the hurried triumph of the Exodus. The keen eye of the aged Lawgiver soon discerned in Hoshea

those qualities which might be required in a colleague or successor to himself. In the Bible he is first mentioned as being the victorious commander of the Israelites in their battle against the Amalekites at Rephidim (^{<02178>}Exodus 17:8-16 B.C. 1658. When Moses ascended Mount Sinai to receive for the first time (compare ^{<02413>}Exodus 24:13, and 33:11) the two Tables, Joshua, who is called his minister or servant, accompanied him part of the way, and was the first to accost him in his descent (^{<02327>}Exodus 32:17). Soon afterwards he was one of the twelve chiefs who were sent (^{<04375>}Numbers 13:17) to explore the land of Canaan, and one of the two (14:6) who gave an encouraging report of their journey. B.C. 1657. The forty years of wandering were almost passed, and Joshua was one of the few survivors, when Moses, shortly before his death, was directed (^{<04278>}Numbers 27:18) to invest Joshua solemnly and publicly with definite authority, in connection with Eleazar the priest, over the people (^{<04338>}Deuteronomy 3:28). After this, God himself gave Joshua a charge by the mouth of the dying Lawgiver (^{<05114>}Deuteronomy 31:14, 23). B.C. 1618. Under the direction of God again renewed (Joshua 1, 1), Joshua, now in his 85th year (Josephus, *Ant.* 5, 1, 29), assumed the command of the people at Shittim, sent spies into Jericho, crossed the Jordan, fortified a camp at Gilgal, circumcised the people, kept the Passover, and was visited by the captain of the Lord's host. (See below.) A miracle made the fall of Jericho more terrible to the Canaanites. A miraculous repulse in the first assault on Ai impressed upon the invaders the warning that they were the instruments of a holy and jealous God. Ai fell; and the law was inscribed on Mount Ebal, and read by their leader in the presence of all Israel. The treaty which the fear stricken Gibeonites obtained deceitfully was generously respected by Joshua. It stimulated and brought to a point the hostile movements of the five confederate chiefs of the Amorites. Joshua, aided by an unprecedented hail storm and a miraculous prolongation of the day (see below), obtained a decisive victory over them at Makkedah, and proceeded at once to subjugate the south country as far as Kadesh-barnea and Gaza. He returned to the camp at Gilgal master of half of Palestine.

In another campaign he marched to the waters of Merom, where he met and overthrew a confederacy of the Canaanitish chiefs in the north, under Jabin, king of Hazor; and in the course of a protracted war he led his victorious soldiers to the gates of Zidon and into the valley of Lebanon under Hermon. In six years, six nations, with thirty-one kings, swell the roll of his conquests; amongst others the Anakim — the old terror of Israel —

are specially recorded as destroyed everywhere except in Philistia. It must be borne in mind that the extensive conquests of Joshua were not intended to achieve, and did not achieve the complete extirpation of the Canaanites, many of whom continued to occupy isolated strongholds throughout the land. (See below.)

Joshua, now stricken in years, proceeded, in conjunction with Eleazar and the heads of the tribes, to complete the division of the conquered land; and when all was allotted, Timnath-serah in Mount Ephraim was assigned by the people as Joshua's peculiar inheritance. The tabernacle of the congregation was established at Shiloh, six cities of refuge were appointed, forty-eight cities assigned to the Levites, and the warriors of the trans-Jordanic tribes dismissed in peace to their homes.

After an interval of rest, Joshua convoked an assembly from all Israel. He delivered two solemn addresses reminding them of the marvelous fulfilment of God's promises to their fathers, and warned them of the conditions on which their prosperity depended; and, lastly, he caused them to renew their covenant with God at Shechem, a place already famous in connection with Jacob (⁽⁻⁰³³⁴⁾Genesis 35:4) and Joseph (⁽⁻⁰²⁴³⁾Joshua 24:32). He died at the age of 110 years, and was buried in his own city, Timnath-serah (Joshua 24). B.C. 1593. According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 147), his grave, ornamented with a handsome monument, is still pointed out at Kefar Charas.

2. His Character. — Joshua's life has been noted as one of the very few which are recorded in history with some fullness of detail, yet without any stain upon them. In his character have been traced, under an Oriental garb, such features as chiefly kindled the imagination of Western chroniclers and poets in the Middle Ages: the character of a devout warrior, blameless and fearless, who has been taught by serving as a youth how to command as a man; who earns by manly vigor a quiet, honored old age; who combines strength with gentleness, ever looking up for and obeying the divine impulse with the simplicity of a child, while he wields great power and directs it calmly, and without swerving, to the accomplishment of a high, unselfish purpose.

All that part of the book of Joshua which relates his personal history seems to be written with the unconscious, vivid power of an eyewitness. We are not merely taught to look with a distant reverence upon the first man who bears the name which is above every name. We stand by the side of one who is admitted to hear the words of God, and see the vision of the

Almighty. The image of the armed warrior is before us as when in the sight of two armies he lifted up his spear over unguarded Ai. We see the majestic presence which inspired all Israel (~~6014~~ Joshua 4:14) with awe; the mild father who remonstrated with Achan; the calm, dignified judge who pronounced his sentence; the devoted worshipper prostrating himself before the captain of the Lord's host. We see the lonely man in the height of his power, separate from those about him, the last survivor, save one, of a famous generation; the honored old man of many deeds and many sufferings, gathering his dying energy for an attempt to bind his people more closely to the service of God whom he had so long served and worshipped, and whom he was ever learning to know more and more.

The great work of Joshua's life was more exciting but less hopeful than that of Moses. He gathered the first fruits of the autumn harvest where his predecessor had sown the seed in spring. It was a high and inspiring task to watch beside the cradle of a mighty nation, and to train its early footsteps in laws which should last for centuries; and it was a fit end to a life of expectation to gaze with longing eyes from Pisgah upon the Land of Promise. But no such brightness gleamed upon the calm close of Joshua's life. Solemn words, and dark with foreboding, fell from him as he sat "under the oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord in Shechem." The excitement of his battles was past; and there had grown up in the mind of the pious leader a consciousness that it is the tendency of prosperity and success to make a people wanton and worldly minded, idolaters in spirit if not in act, and to alienate them from God.

Holy Scripture itself suggests (~~3018~~ Hebrews 4:8) the consideration of Joshua as a type of Christ. Many of the Christian fathers have enlarged upon this view; and Bishop Pearson, who has collected their opinions (*On the Creed*, art. 2, p. 87-90, and 94-96, ed. 1843), points out the following and many other typical resemblances:

- (1.) the name common to both;
- (2.) Joshua brings the people of God into the land of promise, and divides the land among the tribes; Jesus brings his people into the presence of God, and assigns to them their mansions;
- (3.) as Joshua succeeded Moses and completed his work, so the Gospel of Christ succeeding the law, announced One by whom all that believe

are justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses (~~4133~~ Acts 13:39);

(4.) as Joshua, the minister of Moses, renewed the rite of circumcision, so Jesus, the minister of the circumcision, brought in the circumcision of the heart (~~6158~~ Romans 15:8; 2, 29).

3. *Difficulties in his Narrative.* — It has been questioned whether the captain of the Lord's host (Joshua 5, 13-15) was a created being or not. Dr. W.H. Mill discusses this point at full length and with great learning, and decides in favor of the former alternative (*On the Historical Character of St. Luke's First Chapter*. Camb. 1841. p. 92). But J.G. Abicht (*De Duce Exercitus*, etc., ap. *Nov. Thes. Theologico-philolog.* 1, 503) is of opinion that he was the uncreated angel, the Son of God. Compare also Pfeiffer, *Dif. Script. Loc.* p. 173. **SEE ANGEL.**

The treatment of the Canaanites by their Jewish conquerors is fully discussed by Dean Graves, *On the Pentateuch*, pt. 3, lect. 1. He concludes that the extermination of the Canaanites was justified by their crimes, and that the employment of the Jews in such extermination was quite consistent with God's method of governing the world. Professor Fairbairn (*Typology of Scripture*, bk. 3, ch. 4, § 1, ed. 1854) argues with great force and candor in favor of the complete agreement of the principles on which the war was carried on by Joshua with the principles of the Christian dispensation. **SEE CANAANITES.**

Among the supernatural occurrences in the life of Joshua, — none has led to so much discussion as the prolongation of the day of the battle of Makkedah (10, 51, 14). No great difficulty is found, in deciding as Pfeiffer has done (*Dif. Script. loc.* p. 175) between the lengths of this day and that of Hezekiah (~~2211~~ 2 Kings 20:11), and in connecting both days with the Egyptian tradition mentioned by Herodotus, 2, 142. But since modern science revealed the stupendous character of this miracle, modern criticism has made several attempts to explain it away. It is regarded by Le Clerc, Dathe, and others as no miracle, but an optical illusion, by Rosenmüller, following Ilgen, as a mistake of the time of day; by Winer and many recent German critics, with whom Dr. Davidson (*Introd. to O.T.* p. 644) seems to agree, as a mistake of the meaning or the authority of a poetical contributor to the book of Jasher. So Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* 2, 326) traces in the latter part of verse 13 an interpolation by the hand of that anonymous Jew whom he supposes to have written the book of Deuteronomy, and

here to have misunderstood the vivid conception of an old poet; and he cites numerous similar conceptions from the old poetry of Greece, Rome, Arabia, and Peru. But the literal and natural interpretation of the text, as intended to describe a miracle, is sufficiently vindicated by Deyling, *Observ. Sacr.* 1, § 19, p. 100; and J.G. Abicht, *De statione Solis* ap. *Nov. Thes. Theol.-philol.* 1, 516; and is forcibly stated by Bishop Watson in the fourth letter in his *Apology for the Bible*. Barzillai (*Josua und die Sonne*, from the Italian, Trieste, 1869) understands the word, /D, "stand still" (lit. *be dumb*), to signify merely *cease to shine*, and the expression "hasted not to go down a whole day" as equivalent to *withheld its full light!* — in other words, there was an eclipse: how this could be of service to the Hebrews does not appear. **SEE GIBEON; SEE JASHER.**

4. Length of his Administration. — According to Josephus (*Ant.* 5, 1, 29), Joshua commanded the Jews twenty-five years, but, according to other Jewish chronologers, twenty-seven years. The *Tsemach David*, on the years of the Jewish era 2489 and 2496, remarks: "It is written in the *Seder Olam* that Joshua judged Israel twenty-five years, commencing from the year 2488, immediately from the death of Moses, to the year 2516. This, however, would not be known to us but for cabalistic tradition, but in some degree also by reasoning," etc. Hottinger (*Smegma*, p. 469) says: "According to the *Midrash*, Rahab was ten years old when the Israelites left Egypt; she played the harlot during the forty years in which the Israelites were in the desert. She became the wife of Joshua, and eight prophets descended from her, viz. Jeremiah, Mahasia, Hanamael, Shallum, Baruch, Ezekiel. Some say also that Huldah the prophetess was her descendant." Some chronologers have endeavored to reduce the rule of Joshua to seventeen, and others to twenty-one years. There is no good reason for departing from the number assigned by Josephus (see *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1856, p. 450). **SEE CHRONOLOGY.**

5. Other Traditional Notices. — Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.* in ^{<AKB>}Matthew 1:5, and *Chronogr. Lucoe proemis.* 4, § 3) quotes Jewish traditions likewise to the effect that the sepulchre of Joshua was adorned with an image of the sun in memory of the miracle of Ajalon. The Sept. and the Arab. Ver. add to ^{<AKB>}Joshua 24:30 the statement that in his sepulchre were deposited the flint knives which were used for the circumcision at Gilgal (^{<AKB>}Joshua 5:2).

There also occur some vestiges of the deeds of Joshua in other historians besides those of his own country. Procopius mentions a Phoenician inscription near the city of Tingis in Mauritania, the sense of which was: "We are those who fled before the face of Joshua the robber, the son of Nun" (*De Bell. Vandal.* 2, 10). Suidas (sub voce **Χαναάν**): "We are the Canaanites whom Joshua the robber persecuted." Compare Fabricii *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, 1, 889 sq., and the doubts respecting this statement in Dale, *De Origine et Progressu Idolatrioe*, p. 749 sq. Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* 2, 297, 298) gives sound reasons for forbearing to use this story as authentic history. It is, however, accepted by Rawlinson (*Bampton Lecture* for 1859, 3, 91). A letter of Shaubech, by **Ç**, king of Armenia Minor, in the Samaritan book of Joshua (ch. 26), styles Joshua **l wtaql a bydka**, *lupus percussor*, "the murderous wolf;" or, according to another reading in the book *Juchasin* (p. 154, f. 1), and in the *Shalshelath Rakkabbalah* (p. 96), **twbr [baz**, *lupus vespertinus*, "the evening wolf" (comp. ^{<סווס>}Habakkuk 1:8; Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, Tiguri, 1651, p. 40 sq.; Buddeus, *Hist. Eccles.* p. 964 sq.). A comparison of Hercules, according to the Phoenician and Greek mythology, with Joshua has been attempted by Hercklitz (*Quod Hercules idem sit ac Josua*, Lipsiae, 1706; comp. Anton. *Comm. par. libror. sac. V.T., et script. profan.* 4, 5, Gorlic. 1817).

6. Additional Literature on Joshua personally, and his Exploits. — The principal occurrences in the life of Joshua are reviewed by Bishop Hall in his *Contemplations on the O.T.* bks. 7, 8, and 9. — See also T. Smith, *Hist. of Joshua* (Lond. 1862); Overton, *Life of Joshua* (Lond. 1866); Hess, *Gesch. Josuas* (Zur. 1759); Masius, *Josuae historia* (Antw. 1754); Plumtre, *Hist. of Joshua* (Lond. 1848).

Joshua, Book Of,

the first in order of the **yaybāpnāvarā** or *Former. Prophets* in the Hebrew Canon. **SEE BIBLE**. It is so called from the personage who occupies the principal place in the narration of events contained therein, and may be considered as a continuation of the Pentateuch, since it commences with "vav continuative" in the word **yhwh** which may be rendered *thereupon it happened*.

I. Contents. — This book gives an account of the fortunes of the Israelites from the death of Moses to that of Joshua, the son of Nun. Beginning with the appointment of Joshua to succeed Moses as the leader of the people, it proceeds to describe the arrangements made by Joshua in prospect of passing over Jordan (3); the crossing of the river, and the setting up of a memorial on the further side at Gilgal (3-4); the dismay which this occasioned to the Canaanites (^(~~ORIG~~)Joshua 5:1); the circumcision of the males among the people, that rite having been neglected in the wilderness; the observance of the Passover by them in the camp at Gilgal; the ceasing of the manna on the day after they had entered Canaan (^(~~ORIG~~)Joshua 5:2-12); the encouragement given to Joshua to proceed on his enterprise by the appearance of an angel to him (^(~~ORIG~~)Joshua 5:13-15); the siege and capture of Jericho (6); the defeat of the Israelites at Ai (7); the taking of Ai (^(~~ORIG~~)Joshua 8:1-29); the writing of the law on tables of stone, and the solemn repetition from Ebal and Gerizim of the blessings and the curses which Moses had written in the book of the law (^(~~ORIG~~)Joshua 8:30-35); the confederation of the kings of Northern Canaan against the Israelites; the cunning device by which the Gibeonites secured themselves from being destroyed by the Israelites; the indignation of the other Canaanites against the Gibeonites, and the confederation of the kings around Jerusalem against Joshua, with their signal defeat by him (9, 10); the overthrow at the waters of Megiddo of the great northern confederacy, with the destruction of the Anakim (11); the list of kings whose country the Israelites had taken under Moses and Joshua (12); the division of the country, both the parts conquered and those yet remaining under the power of the Canaanites, among the different tribes, chiefly by lot; the setting up of the tabernacle in Shiloh; the appointment of cities of refuge and of cities for the Levites; the return of the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, to their possessions on the east of the Jordan, after the settlement of their brethren in Canaan (13-22); and the farewell addresses of Joshua to the people, his death and burial (23-24). The book naturally divides itself into two parts; the former (1-12) containing an account of the conquest of the land; the latter (8-24) of the division of it among the tribes. These are frequently cited distinctively as the historical and the geographical portions of the book.

a. The first twelve chapters form a continuous narrative, which seems never to halt or flag. The description is frequently so minute as to show the hand not merely of a contemporary, but of an eyewitness. An awful sense

of the divine Presence reigns throughout. We are called out from the din and tumult of each battle field to listen to the still small voice. The progress of events is clearly foreshadowed in the first chapter (vers. 5, 6). Step by step we are led on through the solemn preparation, the arduous struggle, the crowning triumph. Moving everything around, yet himself moved by an unseen power, the Jewish leader rises high and calm amid all.

b. The second part of the book (ch. 13-21) has been aptly compared to the Domesday book of the Norman conquerors of England. The documents of which it consists were doubtless the abstracts of such reports as were supplied by the men whom Joshua sent out (^{<1088>}Joshua 18:8) to describe the land. In the course of time it is probable that changes were introduced into their reports whether kept separately among the national archives, or embodied in the contents of a book — by transcribers adapting them to the actual state of the country in later times when political divisions were modified, new towns sprung up, and old ones disappeared (comp. the two lists of Levitical towns, Joshua 21 and ^{<1065>}1 Chronicles 6:54, etc.).

II. Design. — The object of the book is manifestly to furnish a continuation of the history of the Israelites from the point at which it is left in the closing book of the Pentateuch, and at the same time to illustrate the faithfulness of Jehovah to his word of promise, and his grace in aiding his people by miraculous interference to obtain possession of the land promised to Abraham. The ground idea of the book, as Maurer (*Comment.* p. 3) observes, is furnished by God's declaration to Joshua, recorded 1, 5, 6, that the work which Moses commenced he should finish by subduing and dividing to the tribes of Israel the Promised Land. The book, therefore, may be regarded as setting forth historically the grounds on which the claims of Israel to the proprietorship of the land rested; and as possessing, consequently, not merely a historical, but also a constitutional and legal worth. As illustrating God's grace and power in dealing with his people, it possesses also a religious and spiritual interest.

III. Unity. — On this head a variety of opinions have been entertained. It has been asserted,

1. That the book is a collection of fragments from different hands, put together at different times, and the whole revised and enlarged by a later writer. Some make the number of sources whence these fragments have been derived *ten* (Herwerden, *Disp. de Libro Jos.* Groning. 1826); others

five, including the reviser (*Knobel, Exeget. Hbk.* pt. 13; *Ewald, Gesch. der Israel.* 1, 73 sq.); while others content themselves with three (Bleek, *Einleit. ins. A.T.* p. 325).

2. That it is a complete and uniform composition, interspersed with glosses and additions more or less extensive.

3. That the first part is the composition of one author; but the second betrays indications of being a compilation from various sources (*Hävernick Einleit.* 2, 1, 34).

4. That the book is complete and uniform throughout, and, as a whole, is the composition of one writer. It is impossible here to enter into all the details of this discussion. The reader will find these fully presented by De Wette, *Einleit. ins. A.T.*, 4th and subsequent editions; *Havernick, Einleit.* 1, 1, 1; *König, Alt-testamentl. Studien*, 1, 4; *Maurer, Comment.*; *Keil, Comment.* E. T. p. 3; *Bleek, Einleit. ins. A.T.*, p. 311; *Knobel*, in the *Exeget. Handbuch*, pt. 13; and *Davidson, Introd. to the O.T.* 1, 412.

a. Events alleged to be twice narrated in this book are. Joshua's decease, ch. 23 and 24; the command to appoint twelve men, one out of each tribe, in connection with the passing over Jordan (^{<6682>}Joshua 3:12; 4:3); the stoning of Achan and his dependents (^{<6625>}Joshua 7:25); the setting of an ambush for the taking of Ai (^{<6689>}Joshua 8:9, 12); the rest from war of the land (^{<66123>}Joshua 11:23; 14:15); the command to Joshua concerning dividing the land (^{<6636>}Joshua 13:6); and the granting of Hebron to Caleb (^{<66413>}Joshua 14:13; 15:13). This list we have transcribed from *Knobel (Exeget. Hdbk.* 13, 498). Is it incredible that Joshua should have *twice* assembled the representatives of the people to address them before his decease? May he not have felt that, spared beyond his expectation, it behooved him to avail himself of the opportunity thus afforded to address once more to the people words of counsel and admonition? In the case of the grant to Caleb of Hebron there is undoubtedly a repetition of the same fact, but it is such a repetition as might proceed from the same pen; for the two statements are made in different connections, the one in connection with Caleb's personal merits, the other in connection with the boundaries and occupation allotted to Judah. The taking of Ai will be considered further on. As for the other instances, we leave them to the judgment of our readers.

b. Of the alleged *discrepancies*, one on which much stress has been laid is, that in various parts of the book Joshua is said to have subdued the whole

land and destroyed the Canaanites (⁽⁶¹¹⁰⁾Joshua 11:10; 12:7 sq.; 21:43; 22:4), whereas in others it is stated that large portions of the land were not conquered by Joshua (⁽⁶¹³¹⁾Joshua 13:1 sq.; 17:14 sq.; 18:3 sq.; 23:5-12). It is worthy of note, however, in the outset, that this is a discrepancy which pervades the book, and on which, consequently, no argument for diversity of authorship, as between *the first* and the *second* parts of it, can be built. Again, a discrepancy of this sort is of a kind so obvious, that it is exactly such as a compiler, coolly surveying the materials he is putting together, would at once detect and eliminate; whereas an original writer might write so as to give the *appearance* of it from looking at the same object from different points of view in the course of his writing. Viewed in relation to purpose and effect, the land was conquered and appropriated; Israel was settled in it as master and proprietor, the power of the Canaanites was broken, and God's covenant to his people was fulfilled. But through various causes, chiefly the people's own fault, the work was not literally completed; and therefore, viewed in relation to what ought to have been done and what might have been done, the historian could not but record that there yet remained some enemies to be conquered, and some portions of the land to be appropriated. It was intended (⁽⁶²³⁸⁾Exodus 23:28, 30) (⁽⁶²³⁸⁾Exodus 23:28, 30) that the people should occupy the land little by little. In like manner, it can not be allowed that the general statement (⁽⁶¹²³⁾Joshua 11:23) that Joshua gave the land unto all Israel according to their divisions by their tribes is inconsistent with the fact (⁽⁶¹⁸⁰⁾Joshua 18:1; 19:51) that many subsequent years passed before the process of division was completed and the allotments finally adjusted.

The boundaries of the different tribes, it is said, are stated sometimes with greater, sometimes with less exactness. Now this may be a fault of the surveyors employed by Joshua; but it is scarcely an inconsistency to be charged on the writer of the book who transcribed their descriptions. Again, the divine promise that the coast of Israel shall extend to the Euphrates (⁽⁶¹⁰⁴⁾Joshua 1:4) is not inconsistent with the fact that the country which Joshua was commanded to divide (⁽⁶¹³⁶⁾Joshua 13:16) does not extend so far. Again, the statement (⁽⁶¹³⁵⁾Joshua 13:3) that Ekron, etc., remained yet to be possessed is not inconsistent with the subsequent statement (⁽⁶¹⁵⁵⁾Joshua 15:45) that it was assigned to Judah. Dr. Davidson gives no proof either of his assertion that the former text is in fact subsequent to the latter, or of his supposition that Ekron was in the possession of Judah at the time of its assignment.

Another apparent discrepancy has been found between ^{<1621P>}Joshua 22:2 and 24:14, 23. How, it is asked, could there be "gross idolatry" amongst a people who had in all things conformed to the law of God given by Moses? This difficulty is dealt with by Augustine (*Quoest. in Jos.* qu. 29), who solves it by understanding the injunction of Joshua to refer to alienation of heart on the part of the people from God. This explanation is followed in substance by Calvin and others, and it is apparently the true one. Had Joshua known that "gross idolatry" was practiced by the people, he would have taken vigorous measures before this to extirpate it. But against secret and heart idolatry he could use only words of warning and counsel.

Another discrepancy is thus set forth by Dr. Davidson (*Introd.* 1, p. 415): "It is related that the people assembled at Sichem, 'under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord,' and 'they presented themselves before God,' implying that the tabernacle and ark were there. But we know from 18:1 that the tabernacle had been removed from its former place at Gilgal to Shiloh, where it remained for a long period after Joshua's death" (^{<1621P>}1 Samuel 3:21; 4:3). Here are several mistakes. The phrase "before God" (^{<1621P>}μὴ ἔμπροσθέν) does not necessarily mean "before the ark of the Lord" (comp. ^{<1271P>}Genesis 27:7; ^{<17111>}Judges 11:11; 20:1; ^{<1170>}1 Kings 17:1, etc.; Hengstenberg, *Beitr.* 3, 43); and it is *not* related that "the people assembled under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord," but that Joshua "took a great stone and set it up there under the oak that was within the sanctuary of the Lord" (24:26). The oak referred to was probably a well known one that stood within the spot which had been the first sanctuary of the Lord in Canaan (^{<1126>}Genesis 12:6, 7), and where the nation had been convened by Joshua, on first entering the Promised Land, to listen to the words of the law (^{<1680>}Joshua 8:30-35). No place more fitting as the site of a memorial stone such as Joshua is here said to have set up could be found.

These are the only discrepancies that have even the appearance of seriously affecting the claim of the book to be regarded as the work of one author throughout. The others, which have been discovered and urged by some recent critics in Germany, are such that it seems unnecessary to take up space by noticing them. The reader will find them noted and accounted for in the Introduction to Keil's *Commentary on Joshua*, p. 9 sq. The treatment of the Canaanites which is sanctioned in this book has been denounced for its severity by Eichhorn and earlier writers. But there is nothing in it inconsistent with the divine attribute of justice, or with God's ordinary way of governing the world. *SEE JOSHUA*; also *SEE CANAANITES*.

Therefore the sanction which is given to it does not impair the authority of this book. Critical ingenuity has searched it in vain for any incident or sentiment inconsistent with what we know of the character of the age, or irreconcilable with other parts of canonical Scripture.

c. The alleged differences of *phraseology* and *style* in different parts of the book might deserve more extended notice were it not for the very unsatisfactory state in which this method of inquiry as yet is. Without doubt, it is true that, if it can be shown that these differences are such as to indicate diversity of authorship, the argument must be admitted as legitimate, and the conclusion as valid; but before dealing with such questions, it would be well if it were settled on some scientific basis what is the competent test in such a case, what kind and amount of difference in phraseology and style are sufficient to prove a diversity of authorship. On this head critics seem wholly at sea; they have no common standard to which to appeal; and hence their conclusions are frequently determined by purely personal leanings and subjective affections, and hardly any two of them agree in the judgment at which they arrive. This is remarkably the case with the instances which have been adduced from the book before us. Of these, some are of such a kind as to render an argument from them against the unity of the book little better than puerile. Thus we are told that in some places the word **fbv**, is used for a *tribe*, while in others **hFmiis** is used, and this is employed as a test to distinguish one fragment from another. Accordingly, for instance, in ⁽⁶⁸⁸²⁾Joshua 18:2, 4, 7 are pronounced to belong to one writer, and ver. 11 to another; which is just as if an author, in giving an account of the rebellion of 1745, should speak in the same chapter first of a body of Highlanders as a *clan*, and then of the same as a *sect*, and some critic were to come after him and say, "This could not have been written by one author, for he would not have called the same body by different names." Could it be shown that either **fbv**, or **hFmiis** is a word introduced into the language for the first time at a date much later than the age of Joshua, while the other word had then become obsolete, an argument of some weight, and such as a scholar like Bentley might have employed, would have been advanced; but to attempt to assign parts of the same chapter to different authors and to different epochs simply because synonymous appellations of the same object are employed, is nothing better than sheer trifling. Again, it is said that "the historical parts have the rare word **tqbj** **ini** *inheritance* [rather, *divisions*] (⁽⁶¹²³⁾Joshua 11:23; 12:7; 18:10), which does not appear in the geographical sections" (Davidson, 1,

417). Is chap. 18, then, not in the geographical part of the book? or does a part become geographical or historical as suits the caprice or the preconceived theory of the critic? "Similarly. the geographical portion has /hyræ deyi, *Jordan by Jericho*, 13:32; 16:1; 20:8; a mode of expression wanting in the historical" (*ibid.*). True; but suppose there was no occasion to use the phrase in the historical portions, what then? Are they, therefore, from a different pen from that which produced the geographical? "Again, in the historical parts occur the words, ynbæ [q̄yinh Kh], *Yabehi*, the priests, the Levites (^{418B}Joshua 3:3; 8:33); or simply, ynjæKopriests (3:6, 15; 6:4, 6, etc.); but in the geographical sections the same persons are termed *sons of Aaron* (^{420A}Joshua 21:4, 10, 13, 19)" (*ibid.*). Is there not, however, a reason for this in the fact that, as it was in virtue of their being descended from Aaron, and not in virtue of their being priests, that the Kohathites received their portion, it was more proper to designate them "children of Aaron, of the Levites," than "priests," or "the priests the Levites." Davidson scouts this explanation as one which "only betrays the weakness of the cause." We confess ourselves unable to see this; the explanation is, in our judgment, perfectly valid in itself, and sufficient for the end for which it is adduced; and he has made no attempt to show that it is otherwise. All he says is. "The former is a Deuteronomistic expression; the latter Elohistic." What this is meant to convey we are at a loss to determine, for the only places in which the phrase "sons of Aaron" occurs is in connection with the names of Nadab and Abihu, who *were* sons of Aaron by immediate descent, and must have been so described by any writer, whether Deuteronomist or Elohist.

A number of other words are adduced by the opponents of the unity of the book of Joshua for the purpose of showing that it includes fragments from different authors. On these we do not linger. There are two considerations which seem to us entirely to destroy their force as evidences for that which they are adduced to prove. The one of these is that, according to Ewald, "the later historians imitated the words and phraseology of those who preceded them, and, moreover, that they frequently altered the phrases which they found in the earlier documents." On this Keil (from whom we borrow the statement) remarks with great force, "If that be the case, we can no longer think of peculiarities of style as characteristic signs by which the different sources may be distinguished. His entire theory is therefore built on sand" (*Comment. on Joshua* Introd. p. 9, E.T.). The other observation we would make is, that supposing it made out by indubitable

marks that the book of Joshua has undergone a careful revision by a later editor, who has altered expressions and interpolated brief statements that would not seriously impeach the unity of the book, it would still remain substantially the work of one author. We cannot forbear adding that, in all such inquiries, more faith is to be placed on a sound literary perception and taste than on those minutiae of expression and phraseology on which so much stress has of late been laid by some of the scholars of Germany and their followers in this country. The impression undoubtedly left on the mind of the reader is, that this book contains a continuous and uniform narrative; and its claims in this respect can be brought into doubt only by the application to it of a species of criticism which would produce the same result were it applied to the histories of Livy, the commentaries of Caesar, or any other ancient work of narrative.

IV. *Date of Composition.* — This can only be approximately determined. Of great value for this purpose is the frequent use of the phrase "until this day" by the writer, in reference to the duration of certain objects of which he writes. The use of such a phrase indicates indubitably that the narrative was written while the object referred to was still existing. It is a phrase, also, which may be used with reference to a very limited period; as, for instance, when Joshua uses it of the period up to which the two tribes and a half had continued with their brethren (^{<1621B>}Joshua 22:3), or when he uses it of the period up to which the Israelites had been suffering for the iniquity of Peor (^{<1621F>}Joshua 22:17); comp. also ^{<1621B>}Joshua 23:8, 9. Now we find this phrase used by the historian in cases where the reference is undoubtedly to a period either within the lifetime of Joshua, or not long after his death. Thus it is used with reference to the stones which Joshua set up in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the priests had stood as the people passed over (^{<1649>}Joshua 4:9), and which we cannot suppose remained in that position for a very long time; it is used also of Rahab's dwelling in the midst of Israel (^{<1625>}Joshua 6:25), which must have ceased, at the furthest, very soon after Joshua's death; also of Caleb's personal possession of Hebron (^{<1644>}Joshua 14:14), which of course terminated soon after the time of Joshua. From these notices we infer that the book *may* have been written during Joshua's lifetime, and *cannot* have been written long after. With this falls in the use of the first person in the reference to the crossing of the Jordan (^{<1610>}Joshua 5:1), where one who was present on the occasion is evidently the writer. To the same effect is the fact that no allusion is

anywhere made to anything that is known to have been long posterior to the time of Joshua.

Several words occurring in this book have been adduced as belonging to the later Hebrew, and as, consequently, indicating a later date of composition for the book than the age of Joshua, or that immediately succeeding. But it strikingly shows the precarious basis on which all such reasoning rests, that words are pronounced archaic or late just as it suits the purpose of the inquirer; what De Wette calls late being declared to be ancient by Hävernick and Keil, and what Hävernick and Keil call ancient being again pronounced late by Knobel and Davidson, and with equal absence of any show of reason on both sides. One thing of importance, however, is, that whether the writer has used what modern scholars, judging *a priori*, call later forms or not, he has undoubtedly made no allusions to later facts, and so has given evidence of antiquity which common sense inquirers can appreciate.

V. Author. — Assuming that the book is the production of one writer, and that it was written about the time above suggested, the question arises, To whom is it to be ascribed? That it is the work of Joshua himself is the tradition of the Jews (*Baba Bathra*, cap. 1, fol. 14, B); and this has been embraced by several Christian writers, and among others, in recent times, by König, and, as respects the first half of the book, by Hävernick. That this might have been the case as respects all but the concluding section of the book cannot be denied, but the reasons which have been adduced in support of it have not appeared sufficient to the great majority of critics. These may be thus briefly stated:

- (a) It is evident (^{Q1245}Joshua 24:26) that Joshua could and did write some account of at least one transaction which is related in this book;
- (b) the numerous accounts of Joshua's intercourse with God (^{Q1001}Joshua 1:1; 3, 7; 4:2; 5, 2, 9; 6:2; 7:10; 8:1; 10:8; 11:6; 13:1, 2; 20:1; 24:2), and with the captain of the Lord's host (ver. 13), must have emanated from himself,
- (c) no one is more likely than the speaker himself to have committed to writing the two addresses which were Joshua's legacy to his people (23 and 24);

(d) no one was so well qualified by his position to describe the events related, and to collect the documents contained in the book;

(e) the example of his predecessor and master, Moses, would have suggested to him such a record of his acts.;

(f) one verse (^{<0625>}Joshua 6:25) must have been written by some person who lived in the time of Joshua; and two other verses, 5, 1 and 6 — assuming the common reading of the former to be correct — are most fairly interpreted as written by actors in the scene.

No one would deny that some additions to the book might be made after the death of Joshua without detracting from the possible fact that the book was substantially his composition. The last verses (^{<0629>}Joshua 24:29-33) were obviously added by some later hand. If, as is possible, though not certain, some subordinate events, as the capture of Hebron, of Debir (^{<0653>}Joshua 15:13-19, and ^{<0700>}Judges 1:10-15), and of Leshem (^{<0697>}Joshua 19:47; and ^{<0707>}Judges 18:7), and the joint occupation of Jerusalem (^{<0656>}Joshua 15:63, and ^{<0702>}Judges 1:21) did not occur till after Joshua's death, they may have been inserted in the book of Joshua by a late transcriber. The passages ^{<0632>}Joshua 13:2-6; 16:10; 17:11, which also are subsequently repeated in the book of Judges, may doubtless describe accurately the same state of things existing at two distinct periods.

Other authors have been conjectured, as Phinehas by Lightfoot; Eleazar by Calvin; Samuel by Van Til; Jeremiah by Henry; one of the elders who survived Joshua by Keil. Von Lengerke thinks it was written by some one in the time of Josiah: Davidson by someone in the time of Saul, or somewhat later; Masius, Le Clerc, Maurer, and others, by some one who lived after the Babylonian captivity.

VI. Credibility. — That the narrative contained in this book is to be accepted as a trustworthy account of the transactions it records is proved alike by the esteem in which it was always held by the Jews; by the references to events recorded in it in the national sacred songs (comp. ^{<0442>}Psalm 44:2-4; 78:54, 55; 68:13-15. 114:1-8; ^{<0308>}Habakkuk 3:8-13), and in other parts of Scripture (comp. ^{<0733>}Judges 18:31; ^{<0006>}1 Samuel 1:3, 9, 24; 3:21, ^{<0382>}Isaiah 28:21; ^{<0476>}Acts 7:45; ^{<0908>}Hebrews 4:8; 11:30-32, ^{<0125>}James 2:25); by the traces which, both in the historical and in the geographical portions, may be found of the use by the writer of contemporary documents; by the minuteness of the details which the

author furnishes, and which indicates familiar acquaintance with what he records; by the accuracy of his geographical delineations, an accuracy which the results of modern investigation are increasingly demonstrating; by the fact that the tribes never had any dispute as to the boundaries of their respective territories, but adhered to the arrangements specified in this book; and by the general fidelity to historical consistency and probability which the book displays (Hävernicks, *Einl.* sec. 148 sq.). Some of the narratives, it is true, are of a miraculous kind, but such are wholly in keeping with the avowed relation to the Almighty of the people whose history the book records, and they can be regarded as unhistorical only on the assumption that *all* miracles are incredible — a question we cannot stop to discuss here. *SEE MIRACLES*. In the list of such miraculous interpositions we do not include the standing still of the sun, and the staying of the moon, recorded in ^{<6012>}Joshua 10:12, 13. That passage is apparently wholly a quotation from the book of Jasher, and is probably a fragment of a poem composed by some Israelite on the occasion; it records in highly poetical language the gracious help which God granted to Joshua by the retarding of the approach of darkness long enough to enable him to complete the destruction of his enemies, and is no more to be taken literally than is such a passage as ^{<6014>}Psalms 114:4-6, where the Red Sea is described as being frightened and fleeing, and the mountains as skipping like rams. *SEE JASHER, BOOK OF*. That God interposed on this occasion to help his people we do not doubt; but that he interposed by the working of such a miracle as the words taken literally would indicate, we see no reason to believe.

The account given, ^{<6011>}Joshua 8:1 sq., of the taking of Ai has been much dwelt upon as presenting a narrative which is unhistorical. It is incredible that Joshua sent *two* bodies of men, one comprising 30,000 soldiers, the other 5000, to lie in ambush against the city, while he himself advanced on it with the main body of his army; and yet this seems to be what the narrative states. What increases the improbability here is that the larger body is never mentioned as having come into action at all, for the whole exploit was accomplished by the 5000 and those who were with Joshua. If the case were stated thus: That Joshua took 30,000 of his warriors, and of these sent away 5000 to lie in ambush, while he, with the remaining 25,000, advanced against the city, the narrative would be perfectly simple and credible. The suggestion that verses 12 and 13 are a marginal gloss which has been supposed to creep into the text, leaves the narrative



burdened with the improbable statement that 30,000 men could advance on Ai in daylight, and lie concealed in its immediate neighborhood for several hours without their presence being suspected by the inhabitants. Still less probable seems the suggestion that in these verses we have a fragment of an older record. Keil labors to show that from the peculiar style of Shemitic narrative it is competent to supply, in ver. 3, in thought, from the subsequent narrative, that from the 30,000 whom Joshua took he selected 5000, whom he sent away by night. But, whatever may be the difficulties in this text, it would be unreasonable on this account to relinquish our confidence on the general credibility of the book.

VII. Relation to the Pentateuch. — The Pentateuch brings down the history of the Israelites to the death of Moses, at which it naturally terminates. The book of Joshua takes up the history at this point, and continues it to the death of Joshua, which furnishes another natural pause. From resemblances between the language and forms of expression used by the author of the book of Joshua and those found in Deuteronomy, it has been supposed that both are to be ascribed, in part at least, to the same writer. This, of course, proceeds on the supposition that the book of Deuteronomy is not the composition of Moses; a question on which it would be out of place to enter here. *SEE DEUTERONOMY; SEE PENTATEUCH.* It may suffice to observe, that while it is natural to expect that many similarities of phraseology and language would be apparent in works so nearly contemporaneous as that of Deuteronomy and that of Joshua, there are yet such differences between them as may seem to indicate that they are not the production of the same writer. Thus, in the Pentateuch, we have the word *Jericho* always spelled /j rə] while in Joshua it is always /j yrə] in Deuteronomy we have aNqil aə (iv, 24; 5, 9; 6:15), in Joshua a/Nqil aə (24:19); in Deuteronomy the inf. of arə; to fear, is harjə (4:10; 5:26; 6:24, etc.), in Joshua it is ary] (22:25); in Deuteronomy we have warriors described as LYə/NB] (3:18), while in Joshua they are called l yəhiyrəBə (1:14; 6:2, etc.). We have also in Joshua the peculiar formula /Vaobə/mD; which nowhere occurs in the Pentateuch, but only /b /mD; (<RB> Leviticus 20:9, 11, 12, etc.); the expression /rah; l Kō/da} (3:11, 13), which occurs again only in <RB> Zechariah 6:5; the phrase, "the heart melted" (ii, 11; 5, 1; 7:5); etc. In the Pentateuch, also, we find the usage with respect to the third personal

pronoun feminine fluctuating between **ayhan** and **aWh**; in the book of Joshua the usage is fixed down to **ayh** which became the permanent usage of the language. We find, also, that in the Pentateuch the demonstrative pronoun, with the article, sometimes appears in the form **l abi** while in Joshua and elsewhere it is always **hLabi**. The evidence here is the same in effect as would accrue in the case of Latin writers from the use of *ipsus* and *ipse*, *ollus* and *ille*. That the author of the book of Joshua derived part of his information from the Pentateuch is evident, if we compare ^{<6180>}Deuteronomy 18:1, 2, and ^{<4830>}Numbers 18:20, with ^{<6134>}Joshua 13:14, 33; 14:4. Even the unusual form **rva** is repeated in Joshua. Compare also ^{<6108>}Numbers 31:8, with ^{<6132>}Joshua 13:21 and 22. The author of the book of Joshua frequently repeats the statements of the Pentateuch in a more detailed form, and mentions the changes which had taken place since the Pentateuch was written. Compare ^{<6443>}Numbers 34:13 and 14, with ^{<6137>}Joshua 13:7 sq.; ^{<6237>}Numbers 32:37, with ^{<6137>}Joshua 13:17 sq.; ^{<6570>}Numbers 35 with ^{<6200>}Joshua 21.

There is also considerable similarity between the following passages in the books of Joshua and Judges; ^{<6134>}Joshua 13:4, ^{<0018>}Judges 3:3; ^{<6153>}Joshua 15:13 sq., ^{<0000>}Judges 1:1, 20; ^{<6155>}Joshua 15:15-19, ^{<0011>}Judges 1:11-15; ^{<6152>}Joshua 15:62, ^{<0021>}Judges 1:21; ^{<6160>}Joshua 16:10, ^{<0029>}Judges 1:29 ^{<6172>}Joshua 17:12, ^{<0027>}Judges 1:27; ^{<6197>}Joshua 19:47, ^{<0018>}Judges 18.

VIII. Commentaries. — The exegetical helps expressly on the whole book of Joshua exclusively are the following, of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* 2, 393) also *Homilioe* (*ib.* 2, 397); also *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, 14); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* 4, 292); Procopius, *Notoe* (in his *Octateucham*); Theodoret, *Quoestiones* (in *Opp.* 1, 1) Isidore, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.*); Bede, *Quoestiones* (in *Opp.* p. 8); Rabanus, *in Jos.* (in *Opp.* ed. Martene et Durand, p. 668); Rupert, *In Jos.* (in *Opp.* 1, 321); Tostatus, *In Jos.* (in *Opp.*); Rashi or Jarchi, *Commentarius* (from the Heb. [found in the Rabbinical Bibles] by Breithaupt., Goth. 1710, 4to); Rabbi. Esaia, **vWryPæ**d. with Lat. notes by Abicht, Lips. 1712, 4to; also in the *Thes. Nov. Theol.-Phil.* L.B. 1732, 1, 474 sq.); Borrhäus or Cellarius, *Commentarii* [includ. Ruth, Samuel, and Kings] (Basil. 1557, fol.); Lavater, *Homilioe* (Tigur. 1565, 4to); Calvin, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 1; in French, Genev. 1565; 8vo; transl. in Engl. by W.F., Lond. 1578, 4to; by Beveridge, Edinb. 1854, 8vo); Brentius, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 2);

Karweus, *Excerpta* (in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 20, 497); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lips. 1570, 1575, 8vo); Ferus, *Enarrationes* [includ. Exodus. etc.] (Colon. 1571, 1574, 8vo); *Masius [Rom. Cath.], *Illustratio* (Antw. 1574, fol.; also in Walton's Polyglot, 6, and in the *Critici Sacri*, 2); Chytraeus, *Proelectiones* (Rost. 1577, 8vo); Montanus, *Commentarius* (Antwerp, 1583, 4to); Heidenreich, *Predigten* (Leipz. 1589; Stet. 1604, 4to); Heling, *Periocha* [includ. Ruth, Samuel, and Kings] (Norib. 1593-4, 2 vols. 8vo); Laniado, *rqy;yl*  (Venice, 1603, fol.); Ibn-Chajim, *ṛbʾaibl*  [including Judges] (Venice, 1609, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinical Bible); Serarius, *Commentarius* (Mogunt. 1609/10, 2 vols. fol.; Par. 1610, fol.), Magalianus, *Commentarius* (Turnon. 1612, 2 vols. fol.); Hänicken, *Reisepredigten* (Leipz. 1613, 4to); Drusius, *Commentarius* [including Judges and Samuel] (Franeck. 1618, 4to); Baldwin, *Predigten* (Wittenb. 1621, 4to); Stocken, *Predigten* (Cassel, 1648, 4to); De Naxera, *Commentarii* (vol. 1, Antw. 1650; 2, Lugd. 1652, fol.); a Lapide, *In Jos.* [and other books] (Antw. 1658, fol.); Cocceius, *Note* (in Opp. 1, 309; 11, 47); Bonfrere, *Commentarius* [includ. Judges and Ruth] (Paris, 1659, fol.); Marcellius, *Commentarius* (Herbip. 1661, 4to); Hannecken, *Adnotata* (Giss. 1665, 8vo); Osiander, *Commentarius* (Tübing. 1681, fol.); Ising, *Exercitationes* (Regiom. 1683, 4to); *Schmidt, *Proelectiones* [with Isaiah] (Hamb. 1693, 1695, 1703, 4to); Heidegger, *Exegetica* [includ. Matthew, etc.] (Tigur. 1700, 4to); Uhlemann, *Commentarius* (ed. Martin, Dresd. 1701, 4to); Felibien, *Commentarii* [includ. Judges, Ruth, and Kings] (Paris, 1704, 4to); Le Clerc, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1708; Tübing. 1733, fol.); Moldenhauer, *Erläuterung* [includ. Judges, etc.] (Quedlinb. 1774, 4to); Obornik, *WGrTi* etc. (in the Hebrew Commentary, Vienna, 1792, 8vo, pt. 156); Lightfoot, *Annotationes* (in *Woorks*, 10); Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bibl. Crit.* 1); Meyer, *Bestandtheile*, etc. (in Ammon and Berthold's *Krit. Journ.* 1815, 4to, 2, 337 sq.); Kley, *Ueberstz.* (Leipz. 1817, 8vo); Paulus, *Blicke*, etc. (in his *Theol.-Exeg. Conserv.* Heldeb. 1822, 2, 149 sq.); Herdwerden, *Disputatio*, etc. (Groningen, 1826, 8vo); Maurer, *Commentar* (Stuttg. 1831, 8vo); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1833, 8vo); *Keil, *Commentar* (Erlangen, 1847, 8vo; transl. in Clarke's *Lib.* Edinb. 1857, 8vo; different from that in Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary); *Bush, *Notes* (N.Y. 1852, 12mo); *Miller Lectures* (Lond. 1852, 12mo); Cumming, *Readings* (London, 1857, 8vo); *Knobel, *Erklärung* [including Numbers and Deuteronomy] (in the *Kurzgef. Exeg. Hdbch.* Leipz. 1861, 8vo); Anon., *Gospel in Joshua* (Lond. 1867, 8vo). **SEE COMMENTARY.**

Joshua, Spurious Writings Of.

The Samaritans, who for dogmatical purposes endeavored to depreciate the authority of persons mentioned in the latter books of the Old Testament such as Eli, Samuel, Zerubbabel, and others, had no such interest in attacking the person of Joshua. Eulogius, according to Photii *Codex*, p. 230, states: "The Samaritan multitude believes that Joshua, the son of Nun, is the person concerning whom Moses said, 'The Lord will raise us up a prophet,'" etc. (Compare Lampe, *Comment. in Evangelium Johannis*, 1, 748.) The Samaritans even endeavored to exalt the memory of Joshua by making him the nucleus of many strange legends which they embodied into their Arabic book of Joshua, a work which seems to have been compiled in the Middle Ages, and is quoted by the Rabbinical chroniclers of that period, Sepher Juchasin, R. Samuel, Shullam (f. 154), Shalshleth (*Hakabbalah*, p. 96), Hottinger (*Historia Orientalis*, p. 40 sq.), Zunz (*Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, p. 140). Reland supposed that this book was written at an earlier period, and augmented in the Middle Ages; but it is more likely that the whole is a late compilation. (Compare Hottinger *Smegma*, p. 468.)

The so called book of Joshua of the Samaritans consists of compilations from the Pentateuch, our book of Joshua, the books of Judges and of Samuel, intermixed with many Jewish legends. Its compiler pretends that it is translated from the Hebrew into Arabic, but it was probably originally written in Arabic, and manifestly after the promulgation of the Koran, which exercised a perceptible influence upon it (comp. Reland, *De Samaritanism, Dissertationes Miscellaneoe*, 2, 12 and 68; Rodiger, in the *Hall. Allg. Lit. Zeit.* for 1848, No. 217). The author of this compilation endeavors to prove that the Samaritans are Israelites, and he claims for them the celebrity of the Jews. He attempts to turn the traditions of Jewish history in favor of the Samaritans. By his account Joshua built the temple on Mount Gerizim, and there established public worship; the schism between Jews and Samaritans commenced under Eli, who, as well as Samuel, was an apostate and sorcerer; after the return from the Babylonian exile, the Samaritan form of worship was declared to be the legitimate form; Zerubbabel and his sacred books, which were corrupted, were authoritatively rejected; Alexander the Great expressed his veneration, not for the Jews, but for the Samaritans; these were oppressed under the emperor Adrian, but again obtained permission to worship publicly on Mount Gerizim. The whole book consists of a mixture of Biblical history

and legends, the manifest aim being to falsify facts for dogmatical purposes. This book terminates with the history of the Jewish war under Adrian. The only known copy of this book is that of Jos. Scaliger, which is now in the library at Leyden. Although the language is Arabic, it is written in Samaritan characters. Even the Samaritans themselves seem to have lost it. Huntington, in his *Epistoloe* (Lond. 1704, p. 48), mentions that he could not find it at Nabulus, nor have subsequent inquiries led to its discovery there. An edition, from the only MS. extant, appeared in 1848 at Leyden, with the title "*Liber Josuoe: Chronicum Samaritanum*"; edidit, Latine vertit, etc., T.G.J. Juynboll." It seems never to have been recognized by the Samaritans themselves (De Wette, *Einl.* sec. 171).

Besides this adulterated version of the history of Joshua, there exists still another in the Samaritan chronicles of Abul Phetach. See *Acta Eruditorum. Lips.*, anno 1691, p. 167; Schnurrer's *Samaritanischer Briefwechsel*, in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, 9, 54; a specimen by Schnurrer, in Paulus's *Neues Repertorium*, 1, 117 sq.

The mention of the book of Jasher has given rise to some spurious compilations under that name, as well in Hebrew as in English. **SEE JASHER.**

2. A native of Beth-shemesh, an Israelite, the owner of the field into which the cart came which bore the ark on its return from the land of the Philistines; upon a great stone in the midst of the field the Beth-shemites sacrificed the cows that drew the cart, in honor of its arrival (^{<3064>}1 Samuel 6:14, 18). B.C. 1124.

3. The governor of Jerusalem at the time of the reformation by Josiah; the entrance to his palace was situated near one of the idolatrous erections at the city gates (^{<4238>}2 Kings 23:8). B.C. 628.

4. The son of Josedech (^{<3006>}Haggai 1:1, 12, 14; ^{<3006>}Zechariah 3:1, 3, 9; 6:11), a high priest in the time of Haggai and Zechariah; better known by the name of JESHUA **SEE JESHUA** (q.v.).

Joshua ben-Hananja,

one of the most honored masters in Israel, flourished in the second century of the Christian era. He was a mechanic by trade, and earned his livelihood by continuing to work at his trade even when teacher of the Rabbinical school at Bekein, wither he had removed from Jerusalem after its downfall.

He was a disciple of the celebrated Rabbi ben-Zachai, and did honor to his master as a teacher in Israel. His controversies with Gamaliel and Eliezer ben-Hyrcanos, which are celebrated in the Mishna and the Talmud, evince that he was a very formidable antagonist on account of the force of his reasoning powers and the pungency of his wit. In after life Joshua went with Gamaliel and Akiba to Rome, to plead with Trajan on behalf of his oppressed countrymen, and was received by the emperor with unusual courtesy and respect. It is even reported (though not on any certain authority) that Trajan's daughter, the princess Imra, honored the Jewish Rabbi with her friendship; and that on one occasion, looking at the homely garb in which so much wisdom was encased, she said to him, "Thou art the beauty of wisdom in an abject dress." "good wine." Joshua complacently replied, "is not kept in gold or silver vases, but in vessels of earthenware." When we consider that about this time Judaism numbered many proselytes among the patrician ladies of Rome, to whose aching hearts the herd of old and disreputable deities presented no ground of comfort or hope at all comparable with that afforded by the Hebrew's purer worship — the worship of the one true God — we need not hesitate to credit the truth of this story, and the belief of some that Imra even was a Jewish convert. It is also related that Trajan, in a bantering way, begged the old Rabbi to show him his God, whom he had affirmed to be every where present. After some conversation, Trajan still adhering to his demand to see the God of the Hebrews, Joshua said, "Well, let us first look at one of his ambassadors;" and, taking the emperor into the open air, he desired him to gaze at the sun in his full meridian power. "I cannot," replied Trajan; "the light dazzles me." "Canst thou, then," said the Rabbi, "expect to behold the glory of the Creator, when thou art unable to endure the light of one of his creatures?" In such anecdotes attributed to Joshua ben-Hananja the Talmud abounds, and it is evident that in his day Joshua figured as the most able of all the Rabbins. See Etheridge, *Introd. to Jewish Lit.* p. 61; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 4, 56 sq. (J.H.W.)

Joshua (Or Jeshua) Ben-Jehudah

(called in Arabic *Abulfarag Forkan Ibn-Assad*), quoted by Aben-Ezra as *R. Joshua* (ח[ושע] בן יהודה), a distinguished Jewish philosopher, grammarian, and commentator of the Karaite sect, flourished in the 11th century. From his great piety and extensive knowledge, he obtained the honorable appellation of *the aged* or *presbyter* (*Ha-Saken, A-Sheikh*). His expositions, which

cover the whole of the Old Test., are still in MS. The only fragments printed are given by Aben-Ezra on ^{<1282>}Genesis 28:12; 49:27; ^{<1182>}Exodus 3:2, 13; 4:4; 6:3, 13; 7:3, 12; 8:22; 10:6; 12:5; 15:4; 17:16; 21:37; 22:7; 35:5; ^{<1810>}Leviticus 16:1; ^{<3182>}Hosea 5:7; ^{<2010>}Joel 3:1; ^{<3100>}Amos 9:10; ^{<3170>}Obadiah 17; ^{<3183>}Jonah 3:3; ^{<3187>}Micah 2:7; 7:12; ^{<3187>}Habakkuk 2:7; ^{<1811>}Zephaniah 3:1; ^{<3100>}Haggai 2:10; ^{<3106>}Malachi 2:6; ^{<2003>}Daniel 1:3; 2:4; 4:17; 7:9; 12:2; ^{<1881>}Psalms 88:1; 109:8; 110:3; 119:160; 122:1; 149:6. Compare Delitzsch, in *Aaron ben-Elias*, *yjy /22* [(Leipzig, 1844), p. 315 sq.; Pinsker, *Lickute Kadmoniot* (Vienna, 1860), text, p. 117; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 6, 94 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v.

Joshua Narboni.

SEE VIDAL.

Josi'ah

(Heb. *Yoshiyah'*, *hYvæy*, *healed by Jehovah*, ^{<3160>}*Zechariah* 6:10, elsewhere in the paragogic form *Yoshiya'hu*, *WhYvæy*, and in the text of ^{<1270>}*Jeremiah* 27:1, *WhYvæy*, Sept., N.T., and Josephus *Ἰωσίας*, "Josias." ^{<4010>}*Matthew* 1:10, 11), the name of two men.

I. The sixteenth king of Judah after its separation from the kingdom of Israel, the son (by Jedidah) and, at the early age of eight years, B.C. 640, the successor of Amon (^{<1220>}*2 Kings* 22:1; ^{<1430>}*2 Chronicles* 33:1). His history is contained in *2 Kings* 22-24:30; *2 Chronicles* 34, 35; and the first twelve chapters of *Jeremiah* throw much light upon the general character of the Jews in his days. Avoiding the example of his immediate predecessors, he "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in all the ways of David his father, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left" (^{<1220>}*2 Kings* 22:2; ^{<1442>}*2 Chronicles* 34:2).

1. So early as the sixteenth year of his age (B.C. 633) he began to manifest that enmity to idolatry in all its forms which distinguished his character and reign; and he was not quite twenty years old (B.C. 628) when he proclaimed open war against it, although more or less favored by many men of rank and influence in the kingdom (^{<1443>}*2 Chronicles* 34:3). He then commenced a thorough purification of the land from all taint of idolatry. by going about and superintending in person the operations of the men who were employed in breaking down idolatrous altars and images, and cutting

down the groves which had been consecrated to idol worship (see Bertholdt, *De purgatione per Josiam*, Erl. 1817). His detestation of idolatry could not have been more strongly expressed than by ransacking the sepulchres of the idolatrous priests of former days, and consuming their bones upon the idol altars before they were overturned. Yet this operation, although unexampled in Jewish history, was foretold 345 years before Josiah was born by the prophet who was commissioned to denounce to Jeroboam the future punishment of his sin. He even named Josiah as the person by whom this act was to be performed, and said that it should be performed in Beth-el, which was then a part of the kingdom of Israel (^{1113B}1 Kings 13:2). All this seemed much beyond the range of human probabilities; but it was performed to the letter, for Josiah did not confine his proceedings to his own kingdom, but went over a considerable part of the neighboring kingdom of Israel, which then lay comparatively desolate, with the same object in view; and at Beth-el, in particular, executed all that the prophet had foretold (^{1221B}2 Kings 22:1-19; ^{1484B}2 Chronicles 34:3-7, 32). In these proceedings Josiah seems to have been actuated by an absolute *hatred* of idolatry, such as no other king since David had manifested, and which David had scarcely occasion to manifest in the same degree. So important was this reformation of the public cultus under Josiah that it forms an epoch whence Jeremiah dates many of his prophecies (^{327B}Jeremiah 25:3, 11, 29).

2. In the eighteenth year of his reign and the twenty-sixth of his age (B.C. 623), when the land had been thoroughly purified from idolatry and all that belonged to it, Josiah proceeded to repair and beautify the Temple of the Lord (^{1223B}2 Kings 22:3; 23:23). In the course of this pious labor the high priest Hilkiah discovered in the sanctuary a volume, which proved to contain the books of Moses, and which, from the terms employed, seems to have been considered the original of the law as written by Moses. On this point there has been much anxious discussion and some rash assertion. Some writers of the German school allege that there is no external evidence — that is, evidence besides the law itself — that the book of the law existed till it was thus produced by Hilkiah. This assertion it is the less necessary to answer here, as it will be noticed in the article PENTATEUCH *SEE PENTATEUCH*. (See also De Wette, *Beitr.* 1, 168 sq.; Bertholdt, *Progr. de eo quod in purgatione sacror. Jud. per Josiam facta omnium, maxim contigerit memorabile*, Erl. 1817; also in his *Opusc.* p. 32 sq.) But it may be observed that it is founded very much on the fact

that the king was greatly astonished when some parts of the law were read to him. It is indeed perfectly manifest that he had previously been entirely ignorant of much that he then heard; and he rent his clothes in consternation when he found that, with the best intentions to serve the Lord, he and all his people had been living in the neglect of duties which the law declared to be of vital importance. It is certainly difficult to account for this ignorance. Some suppose that all the copies of the law had perished, and that the king had never seen one. But this is very unlikely; for, however scarce complete copies may have been, the pious king was likely to have been the possessor of one. The probability seems to be that the passages read were those awful denunciations against disobedience with which the book of Deuteronomy concludes, and which, for some cause or other, the king had never before read, or which had never before produced on his mind the same strong conviction of the imminent dangers under which the nation lay, as now when read to him from a volume invested with a character so venerable, and brought with such interesting circumstances under his notice. We should bear in mind that it is very difficult for us in this age and country to estimate the scantiness of the opportunities which were then open to laymen of acquiring literary knowledge connected with religion. The special commission sent forth by Jehoshaphat (~~1477~~ 2 Chronicles 17:7) is a proof that even under such kings as Asa and his son the Levites were insufficient for the religious instruction of the people. What, then, must have been the amount of information accessible to a generation which had grown up in the reigns of Manasseh and Amon? We do not know that the law was read as a stated part of any ordinary public service in the Temple of Solomon (unless the injunction ~~1510~~ Deuteronomy 31:10 was obeyed once in seven years), though God was worshipped there with daily sacrifice, psalmody, and prayer.

The king, in his alarm, sent to Huldah "the prophetess" for her counsel in this emergency, *SEE HULDAH*: her answer assured him that, although the dread penalties threatened by the law had been incurred and would be inflicted, he should be gathered in peace to his fathers before the days of punishment and sorrow came.

It was perhaps not without some hope of averting this doom that the king immediately called the people together at Jerusalem, and engaged them in a solemn renewal of the ancient covenant with God. When this had been done, the Passover was celebrated with careful attention to the directions given in the law, and on a scale of unexampled magnificence. (On the

public importance of this era, see ^{<300>}Ezekiel 1:1, 2.) But all was too late; the hour of mercy had passed; for "the Lord turned not from the fierceness of his great wrath, wherewith his anger was kindled against Judah" (^{<122>}2 Kings 22:3-20; 23:21-27; ^{<140>}2 Chronicles 34:8-33; 35:1-19).

3. That removal from the world which had been promised to Josiah as a blessing was not long delayed, and was brought about in a way which he probably had not expected. Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt, sought a passage through his territories on an expedition against the Chaldeans; but Josiah refused to allow the march of the Egyptian army through his dominions, and prepared to resist the attempt by force of arms. His reason for this opposition has usually been assumed to have been a high sense of loyalty to the Assyrian monarch, whose tributary he is supposed to have been. Such is at least the conjecture of Prideaux (*Connection*, anno 610) and of Milman (*History of the Jews*, 1, 313). But the Bible ascribes no such chivalrous motive to Josiah; and it does not occur to Josephus, who attributes (*Ant.* 10, 5, 1) Josiah's resistance merely to Fate urging him to destruction; nor to the author of 1 Esdr. 1:28, who describes him as acting willfully against Jeremiah's advice; nor to Ewald, who (*Gesch. Isr.* 3, 707) conjectures that it may have been the constant aim of Josiah to restore not only the ritual, but also the kingdom of David in its full extent and independence, and that he attacked Necho as an invader of what he considered as his northern dominions. This conjecture, if equally probable with the former, is equally without adequate support in the Bible, and is somewhat derogatory to the character of Josiah. Necho was very unwilling to engage in hostilities with Josiah: the appearance of the Hebrew army at Megiddo (comp. Herod. 2, 159), however, brought on a battle, in which the king of Judah, although disguised for security, was so desperately wounded by a random arrow that his attendants removed him from the war chariot and placed him in another, in which he was taken to Jerusalem, where he died, after a reign of thirty-one years. B.C. 609. (See J.R. Kiesling's *Essay* on this subject, Lips. 1754.) No king that reigned in Israel was ever more deeply lamented by all his subjects than Josiah; and we are told that the prophet Jeremiah composed on the occasion an elegiac ode, which was long preserved among the people (^{<123>}2 Kings 23:29-37, ^{<143>}2 Chronicles 35:20-27). **SEE LAMENTATIONS.** Compare the narrative in ^{<142>}2 Chronicles 35:25 with the allusions in ^{<220>}Jeremiah 22:10, 18, and ^{<321>}Zechariah 12:11, and with Jackson, *On the Creed*, bk. 8, ch. 23. p. 878. The prediction of Huldah that he should "be gathered into the grave in

peace" must be interpreted in accordance with the explanation of that phrase given in ^{<2815>}Jeremiah 34:5. Some excellent remarks on it may be found in Jackson, *On the Creed*, bk. 11, ch. 36, p. 664. Josiah's reformation and his death are commented on by bishop Hall, *Contemplations on the O.T.*, bk. 20. See also Howard, *History of Josiah* (London, 1842).

4. It was in the reign of Josiah that a nomadic horde of Scythians overran Asia (Herod. 1, 104-106). A detachment of them went towards Egypt by the way of Philistia: somewhere southwards of Ascalon they were met by messengers from Psammetichus and induced to turn back. They are not mentioned in the historical accounts of Josiah's reign; but Ewald (*Die Psalmen*, p. 165) conjectures that the 59th Psalm was composed by king Josiah during a siege of Jerusalem by these Scythians. The town Bethshan is said to derive its Greek name Scythopolis (Reland, *Palest.* p. 992; Lightfoot, *Chor. Marc.* 7, § 2) from these invaders. The facility with which Josiah appears to have extended his authority in the land of Israel is adduced as an indication that the Assyrian conquerors of that land were themselves at this time under the restraining fear of some enemy. The prophecy of Zephaniah is considered to have been written amid the terror caused by their approach. The same people are described at a later period by Ezekiel (28). See Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 689. Abarbanel (ap. Eisenmenger, *Ent. Jud.* 1, 858) records an oral tradition of the Jews to the effect that the ark of the covenant, which Solomon deposited in the Temple (^{<1069>}1 Kings 6:19), was removed and hidden by Josiah in expectation of the destruction of the Temple, and that it will not be brought again to light until the coming of Messiah.

II. Son of Zephaniah, and a resident of Jerusalem after the captivity, in whose house the prophet was directed to crown the high priest Jeshua as a type of the Messiah (^{<3060>}Zechariah 6:10). B.C. prob. 520. "It has been conjectured that Josiah was either a goldsmith, or treasurer of the Temple, or one of the keepers of the Temple, who received the money offered by the worshippers, but nothing is known of him. Possibly he was a descendant of Zephaniah, the priest mentioned in ^{<3201>}Jeremiah 21:1, 37:3; and if Hen in ^{<3065>}Zechariah 6:15 be a proper name, which is doubtful, it probably refers to the same person, elsewhere called Josiah"

Josi'as

a Graecized form of the name of

(a) (Ἰεσίας, Vulg. *Josias*) JOSIAH *SEE JOSIAH* (q.v.), king of Judah (1 Esdr. 1, 1, 7, 18, 21-23, 25, 28, 29, 32-34; Ecclus. 49:1, 4; Bar. 1:8; ^{<400>}Matthew 1:10, 11);

(b) (Ἰεσίας v.r. Ἰεσσίας, Vulg. *Maasias*), JESHAIAH *SEE JESHAIAH* (q.v.), the son of Athaliah (1 Esdr. 8:33; comp. ^{<1807>}Ezra 8:7).

Josibi'ah

(Heb. *Yoshibyah'*, ~~hybyāz~~, dweller with *Jehovah*; Sept. Ἰσαβία v.r. Ἄσαβία), son of Seraiah and father of Jehu, which last was one of the Simeonites who migrated to Gedor (^{<1365>}1 Chronicles 4:35). B.C. ante 711.

Josiphi'ah

(Heb. *Yosiphyah'*, ~~hypasē~~, increased by *Jehovah*; Sept. Ἰωσεφία), one of the "sons" of Shelomith (as the Heb. text now stands), a chief Israelite, whose son (Ben-Josiphiah) returned with a company of 160 males under Ezra to Jerusalem (^{<1810>}Ezra 8:10). B.C. 459. A word, however, has evidently fallen out of the Hebrew text in the beginning of the verse, and is supplied by the Sept. and the author of 1 Esdr. 8:36, as well as (less correctly) in the Syriac; namely, Βαανί (Βανίδ), i.e. *ynB*; omitted from similarity to *ynB*] preceding; thus making *Bani* (q.v.) the son of Shelomith, and the leader of the party of returned exiles.

Josippon.

SEE JOSEPH BEN-GORION.

Joso, Torial

one of Whitefield's preachers, a native of Scotland, was a sea captain by profession. He had a vigorous mind, had been fond of the Bible from his youth, and had acquired a good degree of education by industrious study alone. He was converted by the preaching of Mr. Wesley at Robin Hood's Bay, and soon after began to preach to and exhort his sailors with much effect, who were converted and did likewise. After various reverses in his business, he was constrained by Whitefield to give himself wholly to the

ministry, and in 1766 he became his colleague at the Tabernacle and Tottenham Court. His preaching in London had from the first drawn great throngs and been very useful, and his popularity was only second to that of Whitefield, whose associate he was for thirty years in the Calvinistic Methodist societies of London, usually itinerating in England and Wales four or five months annually. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, 1, 450. (G.L.T.)

Jost, Isaac Marcus,

one of the most celebrated writers of modern Jews, the first of his people since the days of Josephus to write a complete history of the Jews, was born at Bernburg, Germany, Feb. 22, 1793. His father, a poor blind man, the head of a family of twelve children, was obliged to depend mainly upon Marcus, the only boy, for support, and great and severe were the struggles which he had to endure until, in 1803, his father died, and the youth removed to Wolfenbüttel, where his grandfather resided. He was now admitted to a Jewish orphan asylum, where one of his most intimate associates was the celebrated Jewish savant Leopold Zunz, and together these two boys pursued, under great disadvantages and deprivations, ay, sufferings, the studies necessary to admit them to the higher classes of the gymnasium. "Whole nights," he touchingly records, "have we labored by the tapers which we made ourselves from the wax that ran down the big wax candles in the synagogue. By hard study we succeeded in bringing it so far in the course of the six months terminating with April, 1809, that we, Zunz in Wolfenbüttel and I in Brunswick, were put in the senior class (prima) in the gymnasium" (Pascheles, *Sippurim*, 3d col., Prague, 1855, p. 141 sq.). After four years of hard study he removed to the University of Göttingen, where for one year and a half he pursued with great earnestness studies in history, philology, philosophy, and theology, and then continued his investigations at Berlin University. In the capital of Prussia Jost soon won the hearts of many of his people, and, though comparatively a youth, yet succeeded in the management of a first class school, to which flocked the children of Jew and Gentile. In 1835 he accepted the headmastership of the Jewish high school at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and in that capacity spent the remainder of his days. He died November 20, 1860, at Frankfort-on-the-Main. While at Berlin he published:

(1) The gigantic historical work entitled *Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage* (Berlin, 1820-28, 9 vols.): —

(2) *Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes*, etc. (Berlin, 1831-32, 2 vols. 8vo), being an abridgment, with corrections, of the former work: — and

(3) *הנחמ ירדס הַחֶץ*, the Mishna, with the Hebrew text and vowel-points, accompanied by a German translation, a Rabbinic commentary, and German annotations (Berlin, 1832-34, 6 vols.), besides various efforts of a philosophical nature, and numberless contributions to Jewish periodicals of all grades and descriptions. In Frankfort the same literary activity continued. In 1839 he started a weekly journal for Jewish history, literature, etc., of which three volumes appeared, entitled *Israelitische Annalen* (Frankft. a. M. 1839-41), which boasted of the names of some of the ablest of Jewish writers as contributors, and which furnished articles whose value every true Biblical student will not fail to recognize, in fact, for many items of information there contained we would look elsewhere in vain. To reawaken an interest in the study of Hebrew, he started in 1841 (when the *Annalen* were discontinued), in conjunction with the distinguished Jewish writer Creizenach, a periodical in Hebrew, of which two volumes appeared, entitled *עֵשֶׂת יָמִים*, *Ephemerides Hebraicæ s. collectio dissertationum maxime theologicarum, variorumque Hebraicorum scriptorum, ad ordinem mensium lunarium disposita* (Frankfort a. M. 1841-42). Like the former journal, it constitutes a very important contribution to Biblical and Jewish literature, and will always be read with great pleasure by the lover of the sacred language. owing to the beautiful Hebrew style in which in is written. At the same time, however, Jost was also laboring at his grand history of the Jews, of which he published (6), in 1846-47, three more parts, under the title *Neuere Geschichte der Israeliten*, etc., being a continuation. and forming a tenth volume, of his great historical work; and in 1857-59 he finally gave to the world, as the result of his life long historical and critical researches, the *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, a work which may fitly make the top stone of the great historical edifice he had reared so perfectly from the very outset. He found no preparatory work, as did Grätz, Munk, Zunz, and Herzfeld; he was obliged to collect himself all the material needful for his great undertaking, and he spared no pains to do his work well. Jost deserves our notice also as a philanthropist: not only did he serve the literary world, and daily work for the advancement of Jewish interests everywhere, but he also founded an asylum for Jewish female orphans in the city which enjoyed his ripest scholarship. See *Jahrbuch ur die Gesch.*

der Juden (Lpzg. 1861, 12mo), vol. 2, p. 7 sq.; *Jud. Athenoeum* (Grimma and Lpz. 1851, 18mo), p. 117; Ehrentheil, *Jud. Charakterbilder* (Pesth, 1867, 8vo), No. 1, p. 67 sq.; Vapereau, *Dictionnaire des Contemporains*, s.v.

Jot

or, rather, IOTA (Ἰῶτα), the smallest letter of the Greek alphabet (ι), derived from the Hebrew *yod* (י), and answering to the *i* (j) or *y* of European languages. Its name was employed metaphorically to express the minutest trifle. It is in fact, one of several metaphors derived from the alphabet, as when *alpha*, the first letter, and *omega*, the last, are employed to express the beginning and the end. We are not to suppose, however, that this proverb was exclusively apposite in the Greek language. The same practical allusion equally existed in Hebrew, some curious examples of which may be seen in Wetstein and Lightfoot. One of these may here suffice: In the Talmud (*Sanhed.* 20, 2) it is fabled that the book of Deuteronomy came and prostrated itself before God, and said, "O Lord of the universe, thou hast written in me thy law, but now a testament defective in some parts is defective in all. Behold, Solomon endeavors to root the letter *jod* out of me" (i.e. in the text, **יבן; הברך אב**, "he shall not multiply wives," ^{<6171>}Deuteronomy 17:17). "The holy, blessed God answered Solomon, and a thousand such as he, shall perish, but the least word shall not perish out of thee." This is, in fact, a parallel not only to the usage, but the sentiment, as conveyed in ^{<4181>}Matthew 5:18, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." — Kitto. The propriety of the use of this letter for such a proverb is especially evident from the fact that it is the smallest letter of the Heb. alphabet likewise, being, in fact, often dispensed with as a *mater lectionis*, and very liable to be omitted in writing or mistaken for a part of some other letter. **SEE TITTLE.**

Jotapata.

SEE JIPHTHAH-EL.

Jot'bah

(Heb. *Yotbah'*, **יבף**; *goodness*; Sept. Ἰτέβα v.r. Ἰεταχά, Josephus Ἰταβάτη, *Ant.* 10, 3, 2), a town, probably of Judah, the residence of Haruz, whose daughter Meshullemeth became the wife of king Manasseh and

mother of Amon (^{<1219>}2 Kings 21:19). M. de Saulcy (*Narrat.* 1, 94, note) suggests its identity with *Yitma*, a village almost in ruins on the north side of the valley (wady Ribah), north of Lebonah and south of Nablus (Robinson's *Researches*, 2, 92); but this would lie within the precincts of the late kingdom of Israel. It is usually identified with *Jotbath* or *Jotbatha* of the Exode (^{<0233>}Numbers 23:33, 34; ^{<6107>}Deuteronomy 10:7), as the names are essentially the same in the Heb.; but the latter is spoken of only as a *region*, not an inhabited town, and is out of the bounds of the Jewish monarchy. "The Arabic equivalent for Jotbah is *et-Taiyib*, or *et-Taiyibeh*, and no less than three sites of this name are met with in modern Palestine. One is considerably south of Hebron (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2, 472); another to the west of that city (*ib.* p. 427-429); and the third is north of Jerusalem, in the country of Benjamin. This last is most likely to answer to Jotbah, for the two first named places are very insignificant, and never can have been of much importance; whereas this is described by Dr. Robinson as crowning a conspicuous hill, skirted by fertile basins of some breadth,... full of gardens of olives and fig trees. The remarkable position (he adds) would not probably have been left unoccupied in ancient times (*Biblic. Res.* 2, 121, 124). In a subsequent visit to the place he was struck both with the depth and quality of the soil, which were more than one would anticipate ill so rocky a region (*Later Bib. Res.* p. 290). These extracts explain while they justify the signification 'goodness,' which belongs both to Jotbah and Taiyibeh" Against this identification, however, there lie two not very strong objections, namely, its distance from Jerusalem, and the fact of the probable coincidence of this site with that of Ophrah. (q.v.).

Jot'bath

(^{<6107>}Deuteronomy 10:7). *SEE JOTBATHAH.*

Jot'bathah

[some *Jotba'thah*] (Heb. *Yotba'thah*, **hṭbf̄y**; *goodness, i.e. pleasantness*, compare *Agathopolis* [the name is the same with **hḇf̄y**; *Jotbah*, with **h** paragogic appended]; Sept. **Ἰετεβαθά** v.r. **Ταιβαθά**, *a* etc. Auth. Vers. in ^{<6107>}Deuteronomy 10:7, "Jotbath"), the thirty-fourth station of the Israelites during their wandering in the desert, situated between Hor-hagidgad and Ebronah (^{<0833>}Numbers 33:33, 34), and again their forty-first station, between Gudgodah and the Red Sea (^{<6107>}Deuteronomy 10:7). described in the latter passage as "a land of rivers (**μῦλ ἰαῖ**, *winter-brooks*) of waters."

The locality thus indicated is probably the expanded valley near the confluence of wady Jerafeh in its southern part with wady Mukutta el-Tuwarik and others (Robinson's *Researches*, 1, 261), especially wady *el-Adbeh*, which nearly approaches the Heb. name (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* April, 1860, p. 47-49). This is generally a region answering to the description of fertility (Bonar's *Desert of Sinai*, p. 295). Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 213), however, thinks wady *Tuba*, nearer the Akabah, is meant. **SEE EXODE.**

Jo'tham

(Heb. *Yotham'*, ת'י, *Jehovah is upright*; Sept. and N. Test. Ἰωάθαμ, but Ἰωαθάμ in I Chronicles 2:47 Ἰωνάθαν v.r. Ἰωαθαν in ^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 3:12; v.r. Ἰωθάμ in ^{<1317>}1 Chronicles 5:17; v.r. Ἰωάθαν in ^{<1421>}2 Chronicles 26:21; v.r. Ἰωνάθαν in ^{<1423>}2 Chronicles 26:23; Josephus Ἰωάθαμος, *Ant.* 5, 7, 2; 9, 11, 2 sq. Vulg. *Joathan* and *Joatham*; Auth. Vers. "Joatham," ^{<1009>}Matthew 1:9), the name of several men.

1. The second named of the six sons of Jahdai, of the family of Caleb the Hezronite (I Chronicles 2:47). B.C. post 1612.
2. The youngest of Gideon's seventy legitimate sons, and the only one who escaped when the rest were massacred by the order of Abimelech (^{<0095>}Judges 9:5). B.C. 1322. When the fratricide was made King by the people of Shechem, the young Jotham was so daring as to make his appearance on Mount Gerizim for the purpose of lifting up a protesting voice, and of giving vent to his feelings (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 210). This he did in a beautiful parable, wherein the trees are represented as making choice of a king, and bestowing on the bramble the honor which the cedar, the olive, and the vine would not accept. **SEE FABLE.** The obvious application, which, indeed, Jotham failed not himself to point out, must have been highly exasperating to Abimelech and his friends; but the speaker fled, as soon as he had delivered his parable, to the town of Beer and remained there out of his brother's reach (^{<0097>}Judges 9:7-21). We hear no more of him; but three years after, if then living, he saw the accomplishment of the malediction he had pronounced (^{<0097>}Judges 9:57);
3. A person named by Josephus (Ἰωάθαμος, *Ant.* 8, 1, 3) as the son of Bukki and father of Meraioth, in the regular line of Phinehas's descendants, although he (incorrectly) states that these lived privately; he seems to refer to ZERAHIAH **SEE ZERAHIAH** (q.v.) of the scriptural list (^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 6:5). **SEE HIGH PRIEST.**

4. The eleventh king of the separate kingdom of Judah, and son of Uzziah (by Jerusha, daughter of Zadok), whom he succeeded B.C. 756; he reigned sixteen years (comp. the synchronism in ^{<357>}1 Chronicles 5:17). His father having during his last years been excluded by leprosy from public life, the government was administered by his son, at that time twenty-five years of age (^{<421>}2 Chronicles 26:21, 23: 27:1; ^{<253>}2 Kings 15:33). B.C. 781. *SEE UZZIAH*. For the chronological difficulties of his reign (see Crusius, *De oera Jothamica*, Lips. 1756; Winer's *Realwörterb.* s.v.), *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. Jotham profited by the experience which the reign of his father, and of the kings who preceded him, afforded, and he ruled in the fear of God, although he was unable to correct all the corrupt practices into which the people had fallen. His sincere intentions were rewarded with a prosperous reign. He was successful in his wars. The Ammonites, who had "given gifts" as a sort of tribute to Uzziah, but had ceased to do so after his leprosy had incapacitated him from governing, were constrained by Jotham, but not till several years after he had become settled as sole monarch, to pay, for the three remaining years of his reign, a heavy tribute in silver, wheat, and barley (^{<418>}2 Chronicles 26:8; 27:5, 6). Many important public works were also undertaken and accomplished by Jotham. The principal gate of the Temple was rebuilt by him on a more magnificent scale; the quarter of Ophel, in Jerusalem, was strengthened by new fortifications; various towns were built or rebuilt in the mountains of Judah; and castles and towers of defense were erected in the wilderness. Jotham died greatly lamented by his people, and was buried in the sepulchre of the kings (^{<253>}2 Kings 15:38; ^{<473>}2 Chronicles 17:3, 9). B.C. 740. His reign was favored with the ministrations of the prophets Isaiah, Hosea, and Micah (^{<200>}Isaiah 1:1; 7:1; ^{<200>}Hosea 1:1; ^{<300>}Micah 1:1). *SEE JUDAH*.

5. A high priest named by Josephus (Ἰωάθσμος, *Ant.* 10, 8, 6) as son of Joel and father of Urijah in the regular incumbency; probably the AMARIAH *SEE AMARIAH* (q.v.) of ^{<361>}1 Chronicles 6:11). *SEE HIGH PRIEST*.

Joubert, Francis

a noted French ecclesiastical writer, born at Montpellier Oct. 12, 1689, entered the service of the Romish Church in 1728. In 1730 he was imprisoned in the Bastille as a Jansenist, and afterwards exiled to Montpellier. He subsequently returned to Paris, and there died, Dec. 23,

1763. He wrote extensively, especially in the department of exegetical theology. Among his best works we reckon *Explication de l'Hist. de Joseph* (Paris, 1728, 12mo): — *Eclaircissement sur les Discours de Job* (12mo): — *Traite du Caractere essentiel a tous les Prophetes* (12mo): — *Observations sur Joel* (Avignon, 1733, 12mo): — *Lettres sur l'Interpretation des Ecritures* (Paris, 1744, 12mo): — *Concordance et Explication des principales Propheties de Jeremie, d'Ezechieel et de Daniel* (Paris, 1745, 4to): — *Explication des principales propheties*, etc. (Avignon [Paris], 1749, 5 vols.): — *Commentaires sur les Douze petits Prophetes* (Avignon, 1754, 6 vols. 12mo): — *Commentaire sur l'Apocalypse* (Avignon [Paris], 1762, 2 vols. 12mo); etc. See Chaudon et Delandine, *Dict. Univ. Histor. Crit. et Bibliogr.*; Querard, *La France Litteraire*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, 27, 18. (J.N.P.)

Jouffroy, Theodore Simon

a noted modern French eclectic philosopher, was born at Pontets in 1796. In 1832 he became professor of philosophy at the College of France, and continued in this relation until 1837. He died in 1842. He was by far the most celebrated pupil of Cousin, and very popular as a writer of great elegance of style and terseness of diction. He first became known to the public at large through the medium of a translation of Dugald Stewart's *Moral Philosophy*. To this translation he prefixed an essay or preface, in which he vindicates the study of intellectual science against the attacks of those who would banish all except natural philosophy, out of the domain of human investigation. "Nothing," says Morell (*Hist. of Mod. Phil.* p. 662), "can exceed the clearness, and even the beauty, with which he establishes in this little production the fundamental principles of intellectual philosophy." To a careful observer it is evident that he had deeply imbibed the principles and the spirit of the Scottish metaphysicians, while, at the same time, he would generally rise to those more expansive views of philosophical truth which were inculcated in the lectures of his illustrious instructor. In the *Melanges Philosophiques* (Paris, 1833; 2d edit. 1838-43), the second work to which we desire to call attention. "we see," says Morell, "the zealous pupil and successor of Cousin, the genuine modern eclectic, touching more or less upon all points within the range of intellectual philosophy, and pouring light derived from all directions upon them. We feel ourselves in company with a master mind, one who does not servilely follow in the track pointed out by others, but yet who knows how to appreciate the labors of all true hearted thinkers, and to make their

results tell upon the elucidation of his own system." We have not space here to elucidate his system, and refer our readers to Morell. His works were published entire in 6 octavo vols. in 1836. See Caro, in the *Revue de deux Mondes*, March 15, 1865.

Journal, Or Diurnal

is the ancient name of the *day hours* contained in the Breviary (q.v.). By it was also known in monasteries the diary of daily expenses.

Journey

(prop. [*σῆ*]; to *pull up* the stakes of one's tent preparatory to removal; *πορεύομαι*) properly refers to travel by land. *SEE TRAVELING*. In the East, a *day's journey* is reckoned about sixteen or twenty miles. To this distance around the Hebrew camp were the quails scattered for food for the people (^{<OH13>}Numbers 11:31). Shaw computes the eleven days' journey from Sinai to Kadesh Barnea (^{<BOOK>}Deuteronomy 1:2) to be about one hundred and ten miles. The first day's journey (^{<OH4>}Luke 2:44) is usually a short one (Hackett's *Illustra. of Script.* p. 12). *SEE DAYS JOURNEY*.

A *Sabbath day's journey* (^{<OH12>}Acts 1:12) is reckoned by the Hebrews at about seven furlongs, or a little less than one mile, and it is said that if any Jew traveled above this from the city on the Sabbath he was beaten. *SEE SABBATH-DAYS JOURNEY*.

Jove.

SEE JUPITER.

Jouvenci Or Jouveny, Joseph De,

an eminent Jesuit, was born at Paris Sept. 14, 1643. He taught rhetoric with uncommon reputation at Caen, La Fleche, and Paris, and at length was invited to Rome, in order to continue the "History of the Jesuits" with more freedom than he could have enjoyed at Paris. His other principal works are two volumes of speeches, a small tract entitled *De Ratione Discendi et Docendi*, and notes on different classical writers. In his history of the Jesuits he attempts to justify father Guignard the Jesuit, who was executed for encouraging the bigoted assassin Chatel in his attempt on the life of Henry IV. In France Parliament prohibited the publication or circulation of the work on that account. See Gorton, *Biogr. Dict.* s.v.

Jovian

(sometimes, but erroneously, called *Jovinian*), fully FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS JOVIANUS. Roman emperor from A.D. 363 to 364. His predecessor Julian was slain on the field of battle, in his unhappy campaign against the Persians, June 26, A.D. 363. Jovianus, finding the continuation of the unfortunate struggle useless, sought its termination, and secured quite honorable terms from the Persians, and, once free from the attacks of foreign enemies, he at once initiated measures to establish his authority in the West, and hereafter his time was mainly devoted to administrative and legislative business. Immediately after his election to the imperial dignity Jovianus had professed himself to be a Christian, and one of his first measures when peace was restored to his dominions was the celebrated edict by which he placed the Christian religion on a legal basis, and thus put an end to the persecutions to which the Christians had been exposed during the short reign of Julian. The heathens were, however, equally protected, and no superiority was allowed to the one over the other. The different sectaries assailed him with petitions to help them against each other, but he declined interfering, and referred them to the decision of a general council; and the Arians showing themselves most troublesome, he gave them to understand that impartiality was the first duty of an emperor. His friend Athanasius was restored to his see at Alexandria. He died suddenly on his way home from the Orient, A.D. 364. It is possible, though not probable, that he died a violent death, to which Ammianus Marcellinus (25:5-10) seems to allude when he compares his death with that of Emilianus Scipio. See De la Bleterie, *Histoire de Jovien* (Amsterdam, 1740), the best work on the subject. — Smith, *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 615.

Jovinian

emperor, *SEE JOVIAN*.

Jovinian

one of the early opponents of monachism, and, in a measure, one of the earliest reformers before the Reformation, flourished near the end of the 4th century. He was an Italian, but whether a native of Rome or Milan is not known. He taught in both cities, and gained a number of adherents. His *real* opinions, freed from the misrepresentations of his opponents, it is hardly possible to ascertain; it is apparent, however, that he opposed

asceticism, which we find so generally and strenuously advocated in the writings of the Church fathers of the 4th century. He evidently maintained "that there is but one divine element of life, which all believers share in common; but one fellowship with Christ, which proceeds from faith in him; but one new birth. All who possess this in common with each other — all, therefore, who are Christians in the true sense, not barely in outward profession — have the same calling, the same dignity, the same heavenly blessings the diversity of outward circumstances creating no difference in this respect, that all persons whatsoever, if they keep the vows they make to Christ in baptism and live godly lives, have an equal title to the rewards of heaven, and, consequently, that those who spend their lives in celibacy or macerate their bodies by fasting are no more acceptable to God than those who live in wedlock, and nourish their bodies with moderation and sobriety." He also held that Mary ceased to be a virgin by bringing forth Christ; that the degrees of future blessedness do not depend on the meritoriousness of our good works; and that a truly converted Christian, so long as he is such, cannot sin willfully, but will resist and overcome the temptations of the devil. Yet, while upholding all these views, Jovinian himself remained single, and lived like all other monks, and his enemies even admit that the tenor of his life was always blameless. He first advocated his opinions at Milan, but, being there denied by the stern Ambrose all liberty of speech, he went to Rome, which, as appears from the evidence of Jerome, was one of the last places to entertain the ascetic fanaticism, nor was it until after monasteries had darkened all parts of the East, as well as many of the West, that these establishments were seen in that city. There, according to the report of pope Symmachus and others, the doctrine of the Milanese monk had made many converts, so that the Church, "torn by dogs" in a manner heretofore unheard of, doubted whereto so unlooked for an assault might proceed. Not a few of the laity, if not of the clergy, had listened to Jovinian; and eight persons are named as his supporters, who, with him, were, by a unanimous decision of the Romish clergy, condemned and excommunicated in a council held at Milan in 390, as the authors of a "new heresy, and of blasphemy and they were forever expelled from the Church. "Pilate and Herod" were at one in this instance. Pope Symmachus confirmed the condemnation, the emperor Honorius enacted penal laws against the Jovinians, and Jovinian himself was banished to the desolate island of Boa, off the coast of Illyria, and there died before A.D. 406. But Jovinian\ had also written, as well as preached, in support of his opinions, which continued to spread on all

sides, notwithstanding the terrors of Church authority. At Rome, although none dared openly to profess Jovinian's heresy, it was nevertheless covertly taught, and was whispered about, even to such an extent that certain nuns fell into matrimony in consequence of its prevalence. In this emergency, and in aid of the endeavors of the Romish Church to crush the "monstrous doctrine," the good Augustine, a tool of bad men, came forth in defense of the "orthodox" practices and principles of the ascetics; and in his treatise *De bono conjugali*, and in others of a similar kind, he labors hard, by wily sophistry, to reconcile the prevailing absurdities with reason and Scripture. The mild, pious, and honest Augustine, however, was not the man to be the Church's thorough going champion on this notable occasion: she had a better man at hand; "one who, by various learning, by a voluble pen, as well as by rancor of temper, and boundless arrogance, and a blind devotion to whatever 'the Church' had sanctioned, was well qualified to do the necessary work of cajoling the simple, of inflaming the fanatical, of frightening the timid, of calumniating the innocent, and, in a word, of quashing, if it could be quashed, all inquiry concerning 'authorized' errors and abuses. The Church, right or wrong; was to be justified; the objector, innocent or guilty, was to be crushed; and Jerome would scruple nothing could he but accomplish so desirable an object. *SEE JEROME*. But, notwithstanding these attacks by the Church's three greatest doctors — Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, whose great irritation and anxiety on the cause of the Church is sufficiently betrayed by their determination to oppose Jovinians jointly, though living at points quite remote from each other the "heresy," instead of dying out, spread, and was favorably thought of and accepted in different parts of Christendom, and no doubt made easier the task of Vigilantius and of Luther. Neander does not hesitate to rank the services of Jovinian so high as to consider him worthy of a place by the side of Luther. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 265 sq., Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 226 sq.; Ambrosius, *Epist.* 42; Augustine, *De Hoeres.* c. 82; Baronius, *Annales Eccl.* p. 390, 412; Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, 3, 635 sq.; Baur, *Christl. Kirche* (4th to 6th century), p. 311 sq.; Lindner, *De Joviniano et Vigilantio purioris doctrine antesignanis* (Lpz. 1839).

Joy

(usually some form of **l yġ**, which prop. means to *spin round* with pleasurable emotion, and is thus a stronger term than **j mċ**; which expresses *gladness*; but less so than **/l tē** to *exult* or leap with exuberant

joy, Gr. prop. *χαρά*), a delight of the mind arising from the consideration of a present or assured approaching possession of a future good (^{<15166>}Ezra 6:16; ^{<17816>}Esther 8:16).

1. NATURAL joy is of various degrees: when it is moderate, it is called *gladness*; when raised on a sudden to the highest degree, it is then *exultation* or *transport*; when we limit our desires by our possessions, it is *contentment*; when our desires are raised high, and yet accomplished, this is called *satisfaction*, when our joy is derived from some comical occasion or amusement, it is *mirth*; if it arise from considerable opposition that is vanquished in the pursuit of the good we desire, it is then called *triumph*; when joy has so long possessed the mind that it is settled into a temper, we call it *cheerfulness*; when we rejoice upon the account of any good which others obtain, it may be called *sympathy* or *congratulation*.

2. MORAL joy is also of several kinds, as the self approbation, or that which arises from the performance of any good actions; this is called *peace*, or *serenity* of conscience; if the action be honorable and the joy rise high, it may be called *glory*.

3. There is also a SPIRITUAL joy, which the Scripture calls a "fruit of the Spirit" (^{<8162>}Galatians 5:22), "the joy of faith" (^{<5025>}Philippians 1:25), and "the rejoicing of hope" (Hebrews 3, 6). The objects of it are —

- (1.) God himself (^{<3944>}Psalms 43:4, ^{<2510>}Isaiah 61:10).
 - (2.) Christ (^{<5033>}Philippians 3:3; ^{<6003>}1 Peter 1:8).
 - (3.) The promises (^{<33912>}Psalms 119:162).
 - (4.) The administration of the Gospel and Gospel ordinances (^{<1895>}Psalms 89:15).
 - (5.) The prosperity of the interest of Christ (^{<4453>}Acts 15:3; ^{<6115>}Revelation 11:15, 17).
 - (6.) The happiness of a future state (^{<8162>}Romans 5:2; ^{<4251>}Matthew 25).
- The nature and properties of this joy:
- [1.] It is, or should be, constant (^{<5004>}Philippians 4:4).
 - [2.] It is unknown to the men of the world (^{<4124>}1 Corinthians 2:14).
 - [3.] It is unspeakable (^{<6003>}1 Peter 1:8).

[4.] It is permanent (^{<B672>}John 16:22). See Watts, *On Pass.* sec. 31: Gil's *Body of Div.* 3, 111, 8vo ed.; Grove's *Moral Philippians* 1, 356.

Joy Of God

relates,

1. To the delight and complacency he has in himself, his own nature, and perfections.
2. He rejoices in his own works (^{<D461>}Psalm 104:31).
3. In his Son Christ Jesus (^{<4017>}Matthew 3:17).
4. In the work of redemption (^{<B15>}John 3:15). 5. In the subjects of his grace (^{<E711>}Psalm 147:11; ^{<B17>}Zephaniah 3:17; ^{<E904>}Psalm 149:4.

Joy Or Joye, George

an early promoter of the Reformation, a native of the county of Bedford, was educated at Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he graduated M.A. in 1517. An associate of Tyndale, he was in 1527 accused of heresy, and obliged to go to Germany, where he resided for many years. He was concerned in the superintendence of Tyndale's Bibles, printed at Antwerp, and finally returned to his native country but the time of his death is unknown. Besides his translation of part of the Bible, he published *On the Unity and Schism of the ancient Church* (1534) — *Subversion of More's False Foundation* (1534): — *Commentary on Daniel*, in the main from Melancthon, etc. See Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Joyner, James E.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Amherst County, Va., and died at his own home in Henly County, Va., March 15, 1868. For more than thirty years Joyner served the Church with great acceptability and usefulness in various appointments. His preaching was earnest, pointed, and eminently practical During the late war he served as a chaplain in the Confederate States army, and exerted among the officers and men an influence for good which was felt and acknowledged by all. — *Conf. Minutes M. E. Church South*, 3, 203.

Joz'abad

(Heb. *Yozabad'*, *dbz/y*, a contraction for JEHOZABAD; Sept. Ἰωζαβάδ, but sometimes in Chronicles Ἰωζαβάθ v.r. Ἰωζαβαίθ, Ἰεζεβούθ; also Ἰωσαβέδ or Ἰωσαβάρδ in Nehemiah; Auth. Vers. "Josabad" in ^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 12:4), the name of several men.

1. A Gederathite, one of the famous Benjamite archers who joined David at Ziklag (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 12:4). B.C. 1055.

2. A chiliarch of Manasseh, who reinforced David on retreating to Zildag (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 12:20), B.C. 1053.

3. Another chiliarch of Manasseh, who deserted Saul's cause for that of David when he made Ziklag his residence (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 12:20); it is possible, however, that the name has been erroneously repeated for the preceding. B.C. 1053.

4. Probably a Levite, one of the persons charged with the care of the Temple offerings under the superintendence of Cononiah and Shimei, at the reformation by Hezekiah (^{<1413>}2 Chronicles 31:13). B.C. 726.

5. One of the chief Levites who made offerings for the renewal of the Temple services under Josiah (^{<1450>}2 Chronicles 35:9). B.C. 623.

6. A son of Jeshua, and one of the Levites who took account of the precious metals and vessels offered for the Temple by the Israelites who declined personally to return from the captivity (^{<1503>}Ezra 8:33). B.C. 459. He was probably the same with one of the chief Levites who "had the oversight of the outward matters of the house of God" after the reestablishment at Jerusalem (^{<1616>}Nehemiah 11:16). B.C. cir. 440. He was possibly identical with No. 8.

7. An Israelite, one of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (^{<1502>}Ezra 10:22). B.C. 459.

8. One of the Levite who divorced his heathen wife after the return from Babylon (^{<1503>}Ezra 10:23). B.C. 459. He is probably identical with one of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the Law to the people assembled in the Tyropoeon (^{<1607>}Nehemiah 8:7). B.C. cir. 410.

Joz'achar

(Heb. *Yozakar'*, רכז'י, *Jehovah-remembered*; Sept. Ἰωσαβὰδ v.r. Ἰωζαχάρ), the son of Shimeath, an Ammonitess, one of the two servants who assassinated Jehoash, king of Judah, in Millo (^{<1221>}2 Kings 12:21). In the parallel passage (^{<1226>}2 Chronicles 24:26) the name is erroneously written ZABAD. B.C. 837. "It is uncertain whether their conspiracy was prompted by a personal feeling of revenge for the death of Zechariah, as Josephus intimates (*Ant.* 9, 8, 4), or whether they were urged to it by the family of Jehoiada. The care of the chronicler to show that they were of foreign descent seems almost intended to disarm a suspicion that the king's assassination was an act of priestly vengeance. But it is more likely that the conspiracy had a different origin altogether, and that the king's murder was regarded by the chronicler as an instance of divine retribution. On the accession of Amaziah the conspirators were executed."

Joz'adak

(^{<1512>}Ezra 3:2, 8; 5:2; 10:18; ^{<1622>}Nehemiah 12:26). *SEE JEHOZADAK.*

Juan de Dios.

SEE JOHN DE DIEU.

Juan Valdez.

SEE VALDEZ.

Ju'bal

(Heb. *Yubal'*, יבול, prob. for יבול, *jubilee*, i.e. *music* Sept. Ἰουβάλλ), Lamech's second son by Adah, of the line of Cain; described as the inventor of the רננכ, *kinnor*, and the בגול, *ugab*, rendered in our version "the harp and the organ," but perhaps more properly "the lyre and mouth-organ," or Pandaeon pipe (^{<1102>}Genesis 4:21). See Music. B.C. prob. cir. 3490. According to Josephus (Ἰούβαλος, *Ant.* 1, 2, 2), "he cultivated music, and invented the psaltery and cithara." Some have compared him with the Apollo of heathen mythology (Hasse's *Entdeck.* 2, 37; comp. Euseb. *Proep. Evang.* 10, 6; Diod. Sic. 1, 20; Buttmann, *Mythol.* 1, 164; Kalisch, *Commentary*, ad loc.).

Jubilate.

SEE SUNDAY.

Ju'bilee

(Heb. *Yobel'*, **l báy** or **l bé**, a joyful *shout* or *clangor* of trumpets; once in the Author. Vers. for **h[WrT]** ^{<R230>}Leviticus 25:9, which is elsewhere rendered "a shout," etc.), usually in the connection YEAR OF JUBILEE (**l báy[hitnív]**) or merely **l báy**, as in ^{<R253>}Leviticus 25:28; Septuag. usually translates **ἔτος τῆς ἀφέσεως**, or simply **ἄφεςις**; but Graecizes **Ἰωβήλ** in ^{<R108>}Joshua 6:8, 13; Josephus Graecizes **Ἰώβηλος**, *Ant.* 3, 12, 3; Vulgate *annus jubilee, orjubilceus*, but *buccina* in ^{<R293>}Exodus 19:13); also galled the "year of liberty" (**r/rD]tnív]** ^{<R417>}Ezekiel 46:17), the great semi-centennial epoch of the Hebrews, constituting a festival, and marked by striking public and domestic changes. The relation in which it stood to the sabbatical year, and the general directions for its observance, are given ^{<R238>}Leviticus 25:8-16 and 23-55. Its bearing on lands dedicated to Jehovah is stated ^{<R276>}Leviticus 27:16-25. There is no mention of the jubilee in the book of Deuteronomy, and the only other reference to it in the Pentateuch is in the appeal of the tribe of Manasseh, on account of the daughters of Zelophehad (^{<R104>}Numbers 36:4). It is rarely mentioned in the prophetic books, but is very frequently referred to by Talmudical writers. **SEE FESTIVAL.**

I. Signification of the Name. — According to pseudo-Jonathan (*Targum* on ^{<R105>}Joshua 6:5-9), the Talmud (*Rosh Ha-shana*, 26, a), Rashi, Aben-Ezra (on ^{<R248>}Exodus 19:3), Kimchi (on ^{<R116>}Joshua 5:6), and other Jewish authorities, the meaning *ram*, which **l báy** seems at times to bear (see *Fürst.*, *Lexicon*, s.v.; but Gesenius utterly denies this sense), is the primary one; hence metonymically a *ram's horn* (comp. ^{<R293>}Exodus 19:13 with ^{<R105>}Joshua 6:5); and so the *sound* of a ram's horn, like the Latin *buccina*. According to another ancient interpretation, the Heb. word is from a root **l bj**; to *liberate* (parallel with **rwrD**, a *freed captive*; comp. Hitzig on ^{<R418>}Jeremiah 34:8); an etymology which is somewhat sanctioned by ^{<R250>}Leviticus 25:10, and the usual rendering of the Sept. (also Josephus, **ἐλευθερίανδὲ σημαίνει τοῦνομα**, *Ant.* 3, 12, 3; and by St. Jerome, *Jobel est demittens aut mittens*, *Comment. ad loc.*). Others, again, regard the root **l bj** as onomatopoeic, like the Latin *jubilare*, denoting *to*

bejubilant (Gesenius, etc.). Most modern critics, however; derive **l bwy** from the better known root **l by**, *to flow impetuously* (^{<0157>}Genesis 6:17), and hence assign to It the meaning of *the loud or impetuous sound* (^{<0021>}Genesis 4:21) streaming forth from the trumpet, and proclaiming this festival. The other notions respecting the word may be found in Fuller (*Misc. Sac.* p. 1026 sq.; *Critici Sacri*, vol. 9), in Carpzov (p. 448 sq.), and, most completely given, in Kranold (p. 11 sq.).

II. Laws connected with this Festival. — These embrace the following three main points:

1. Rest for the Soil. — This enactment, which is comprised in ^{<0251>}Leviticus 25:11, 12, enjoins that, as on the Sabbatical year, the land should lie fallow, and that there should be no tillage nor harvest during the jubilee year. The Israelites, however, were permitted to fetch the spontaneous produce of the field for their immediate wants (**htawbt ta wl bat hdçh ^f**), but not to lay it up in their storehouses.

2. Reversion of landed Property. — This provision is comprised in ^{<0253>}Leviticus 25:13-34; 27:16-24. The Mosaic law enacted that the Promised Land should be divided by lot, in equal parts, among the Israelites, and that the plot which should thus come into the possession of each family was to be absolutely inalienable, and forever continue to be the property of the descendants of the original possessor. **SEE LAND**. When a proprietor, therefore, being pressed by poverty, had to dispose of a field, no one could buy it of him for a longer period than up to the time of the next jubilee, when it reverted to the original possessor, or to his family. Hence the sale, properly speaking, was not of the land, but of the produce of so many years, and the price was fixed according to the number of years (**tawbt ynç**) up to the next jubilee, so as to prevent any injustice being done to those who were compelled by circumstances to part temporarily with their land (^{<0255>}Leviticus 25:15, 16). The lessee, however, according to Josephus, in case he had made great outlays on the field just before he was required by the law of jubilee to return it to its owner, could claim compensation for these (*Ant.* 3, 12, 3). But even before the jubilee year the original proprietor could recover his field, if either his own circumstances improved, or if his next of kin, **SEE GOEL** could redeem it for him by paying back according to the same price which regulated the purchase (^{<0256>}Leviticus 25:26, 27). In the interests of the purchaser, however, the

Rabbinical law enacted that this redemption should not take place before he had the benefit of the field for *two productive years* (so the Rabbins understood **tawbt ynç**), exclusive of a sabbatical year, a year of barrenness, and of the first harvest, if he happened to buy the plot of land shortly before the seventh month, i.e. with the ripe fruit (*Erachin*, 9, 1; Maimonides, *Jobel*, 11, 10-13). As poverty is the only reason which the law supposes might lead one to part with his field, the Rabbins enacted that it was not allowable for any one to sell his patrimony on speculation (comp. Maimonides, *Jobel*, 11, 3). Though nothing is here said about fields which were *given away* by the proprietors, yet there can be no doubt, as Maimonides says (*ibid.* 11, 10), that the same law is intended to apply to gifts (comp. ^{<3637>}Ezekiel 46:17), but not to those plots of land which came into a man's possession through marriage with an heiress (^{<0804>}Numbers 36:4-9; compare Mishna, *Berachoth*, 8, 10). Neither did this law apply to a house in a walled city. Still, the seller had the privilege of redeeming it at any time within a full year from the day of the sale. After the year it became the absolute property of the purchaser (^{<0829>}Leviticus 25:29, 30, Keri). As this law required a more minute definition for practical purposes, the Rabbins determined that this right of redemption might be exercised from the very first day of the sale to the last day which made up the year. Moreover, as the purchaser sometimes concealed himself towards the end of the year, in order to prevent the seller from redeeming his house, it was enacted that when the purchaser could not be found, the original proprietor should hand over the redemption — money to the powers that be, break open the doors, and take possession of the house; and if the purchaser died during the year, the original proprietor could redeem it from the heir (comp. Mishna, *Erachin*, 9, 3,4; Maimonides, *Jobel*, 12, 1-7). Open places, however, which are not surrounded by walls, belong to landed property, and, like the cultivated land on which they stand, are subject to the law of jubilee, and must revert to their original proprietors (^{<0823>}Leviticus 25:31). But, although houses in open places are thus treated like fields; yet, according to the Rabbinic definition, the reverse is not to be the case; i.e. fields or other places not built upon in walled cities are not to be treated as cities, but come under the jubilee law of fields (comp. *Erachin*, 9, 5). The houses of the Levites, in the forty-eight cities given to them (^{<0850>}Numbers 35:1-8), were exempt from this general law of house property. Having the same value to the Levites as landed property had to the other tribes, these houses were subject to the jubilee law for fields, and could at any time be redeemed (^{<0822>}Leviticus 25:32; comp. *Erachin*, 9, 8), so that, even if a

Levite redeemed the house which his brother Levite was obliged to sell through poverty, the general law of house property is not to obtain, even among the Levites themselves, but they are obliged to treat each other according to the law of landed property. Thus, for instance, the house of A, which he, out of poverty, was obliged to sell to the non-Levite B, and was redeemed from him by a Levite C, reverts in the jubilee year from C to the original Levitical proprietor A. This seems to be the most probable meaning of the enactment contained in ⁽¹⁸²³⁾Leviticus 25:33, and it does not necessitate us to insert into the text the negative particle *al* before *l agy*, as is done by the Vulgate, Houbigant, Ewald (*Alterthümer*, p.421), Knobel, etc., nor need we, with Rashi, Aben-Ezra, etc., take *l ag* in the unnatural sense of *buying*. The lands in the suburbs of their cities the Levites were not permitted to part with under any condition, and therefore these did not come under the law of jubilee (ver. 34). The only exception to this general law were the houses and the fields consecrated to the Lord, or to the support of the sanctuary. If these were not redeemed before the ensuing jubilee, instead of reverting to their original proprietors, they at the jubilee became forever the property of the priests (⁽¹⁸⁷³⁾Leviticus 27:20, 21). The conditions, however, on which consecrated property could be redeemed were as follows: A house thus devoted to the Lord was valued by the priest, and the donor who wished to redeem it had to pay one fifth in addition to this fixed value (⁽¹⁸⁷⁴⁾Leviticus 27:14, 15). A field was valued according to the number of homers of barley which could be sown thereon, at the rate of fifty silver shekels of the sanctuary for each homer for the whole fifty years, deducting from it a proportionate amount for the lapse of each year (⁽¹⁸⁷⁶⁾Leviticus 27:16-18). According to the Talmud the fiftieth year was not counted. Hence, if any one wished to redeem his field, he had to pay one fifth in addition to the regular rate of a *sela* (shekel), and a *pundium* (=1-48th *sela*) per annum for every homer, the surplus *pundium* being intended for the forty-ninth year. No one was therefore allowed to sanctify his field during the year which immediately preceded the jubilee, for he would then have to pay for the whole forty-nine years, because months could not be deducted from the sanctuary, and the jubilee year itself was not counted (Mishna, *Erachin*, 7, 1). If one sanctified a field which he had purchased, i.e. not freehold property, it reverted to the original proprietor in the year of jubilee (⁽¹⁸⁷²⁾Leviticus 27:22-24).

3. Manumission of those Israelites who had become Slaves. — This enactment is comprised in ⁽¹⁸⁵³⁾Leviticus 25:39-45. All Israelites who through

poverty had sold themselves as slaves to their fellow Israelites or to the foreigners resident among them, and who, up to the time of the jubilee, had neither completed their six years of servitude, nor redeemed themselves, nor been redeemed by their relatives, were to be set free in the jubilee, to return with their children to their family and to the patrimony of their fathers. Great difficulty has been experienced in reconciling the injunction here, that in the jubilee all slaves are to regain their freedom, with ^{<0276>}Exodus 25:6, where it is enacted that those bondmen who refuse their liberty at the expiration of the appointed six years' servitude, and submit to the boring of their ears, are to be *slaves forever* (מל [ל wdb[w]). Josephus (*Ant.* 4, 8, 28), the Mishna (*Kidushin*, 1, 3) and Talmud (*ibid.* 14, 15), Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Maimonides (*Hilchoth Abadim*, 3, 6), and most Jewish interpreters, who are followed by Ainsworth, Bp. Patrick, and other Christian commentators, take, ל [ל to denote *till the jubilee*, maintaining that the slaves who submitted to have their ears bored are included in this general manumission, *and* thus try to escape the difficulty. But against this is to be urged, that, 1. The phrase, ל [ל db[is used in ^{<0254>}Leviticus 25:46 for *perpetual* servitude, which is unaffected by the year of jubilee. 2. The declaration of the slave that he will not have his freedom, in ^{<0206>}Exodus 21:5, unquestionably shows that perpetual slavery is meant. 3. Servitude till the year of jubilee is not at all spoken of in ^{<0254>}Leviticus 25:40-42 as something contemptible, and therefore could not be *the punishment designed* for him who refused his freedom, especially if the year of jubilee happened to occur *two* or *three* years after refusing his freedom; and that it is bondage beyond that time which is characterized as real slavery; and, 4. The jubilee, without any indication whatever from the lawgiver, is here, according to this explanation, made to give the slave the right to take with him the maid and the children who are the property of the master the very right which had previously been denied to him. Ewald, therefore (*Alterthümer*, p. 421), and others, conclude that the two enactments belong to different periods, the manumission of slaves in the year of jubilee having been instituted when the law enjoining the liberation of slaves at the expiration of six years had become obsolete; while Knobel (on ^{<0206>}Exodus 21:6) regards this jubilee law and the enactments in ^{<0206>}Exodus 21:5, 6 as representing one of the many contradictions which exist between the Jehovistic and Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch. All the difficulties, however, disappear when the jubilee manumission enactment is regarded as designed to supplement the law in ^{<0202>}Exodus 21:2-6. In the latter case *the*

regular period of servitude is fixed, at the expiration of which the bondman is *ordinarily* to become free, While ^{<R239>}Leviticus 25:39-54 institutes an additional and *extraordinary* period, when those slaves who had not as yet completed their appointed six years of servitude at the time of jubilee, or had not forfeited their right of free citizenship by spontaneously submitting to the yoke of bondage, and becoming slaves forever (μλ [db[), are once in every fifty years to obtain their freedom. The one enactment refers to *the freedom of each individual* at different days, weeks, months, and years, inasmuch as hardly any twenty of them entered on their servitude at exactly the same time, while the other legislates for a general manumission, which is to take place at exactly the same time. The enactment in ^{<R239>}Leviticus 25:39-54, therefore, takes for granted the law in ^{<R210>}Exodus 21:2-6, and begins where the latter ends, and does not mention it because it simply treats on the influence of jubilee upon slavery.

4. That there must also have been a perfect remission of debts in the year of jubilee is self evident, for it is implied in the fact that all persons who were in bondage for debt, as well as all the landed property of debtors, were freely returned. Whether debts generally, for which there were no such pledges, were remitted, is a matter of dispute. Josephus positively declares. that they were (*Ant.* 13, 2,3), while Maimonides (*Jobel*, 10, 16) as positively denies it.

III. *Time when the Jubilee was celebrated.* — According to ^{<R218>}Leviticus 25:8-11, it is evident that forty-nine years are to be counted, and that at the end thereof *the fiftieth* year is to be celebrated as the jubilee. Hence the jubilee is to follow immediately upon the sabbatical year, so that there are to be two successive fallow years. This is also corroborated by verse 21, where it is promised that the produce of the sixth year shall suffice for three years, i.e. forty-nine, fifty, and fifty-one, or the two former years, which are the sabbatical year and the jubilee, and the immediately following year, in which the ordinary produce of the preceding year would be wanting. Moreover, from the remark in verse 22, it would appear that the sabbatical year, like the jubilee, began in the autumn, or the month of Tisri, which commenced *the civil* year, when it was customary to begin sowing for the ensuing year. At all events, ver. 9 distinctly says that the jubilee is to be proclaimed by the blast of the trumpet, " on the tenth of the seventh month, on the day of atonement," which is Tisri. **SEE ATONEMENT, DAY**

OF. The opinion that the sabbatical year and the jubilee were distinct, or that there were *two fallow years*, is also entertained by the Talmud (*Rosh Ha-Shana*, 8 b, 9 a), Philo (*On the Decalogue*, 30), Josephus (1.c.), and many other ancient writers. It must, however, be borne in mind that, though there was to be no sowing, nor any regular harvest, during these two years, yet the Israelites were allowed to fetch from the fields whatever they wanted (^(-RSP)Leviticus 25:12). That the fields did yield a crop in their second fallow year is most unquestionably presupposed by the prophet Isaiah (37:30). Palestine was, at all events, not less fruitful than Albania, in which Strabo tells us (lib. 11, c. 4, sec. 3), "The ground that has been sowed once produces in many places two or three crops, the fruit of which is even fifty-fold."

It must, however, be remarked, that many, from a very early period down to the present day, have taken the jubilee year to be identical with the seventh sabbatical year. Thus the "*Book of Jubilees*," which dates prior to the Christian era, *SEE JUBILEES, BOOK OF*, divides the Biblical history from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan into fifty jubilees of *forty-nine* years each, which shows that this view of the jubilee must have been pretty general in those days. Some Rabbins in the Talmud (*Erachin*, 12 b, with 33 a), as well as many Christian writers (Scaliger, Petavius, Usher, Cunaeus, Calvitiu, Gatterer, Frank, Schröder, Hug, Rosenmüller), support the same view. As to the remark, "Ye shall hallow *the fiftieth year*" (ver. 10), "*a jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you*" (ver. 11), it is urged that this is in accordance with a mode of speech which is common to all languages and ages. Thus we call a week *eight days*, including both Sundays, and the best classical writers called an *olympiad* by the name of *quinquennium*, though it only contained four entire years. Moreover, the sacred *number seven*, or *the sabbatic idea*, which underlies all the festivals, and connects them all into one chain, the last link of which is the jubilee, corroborates this view, inasmuch as we have,

1. A Sabbath of days;
2. A Sabbath of weeks (*the seventh week* after the Passover being the Sabbath week, as the first day of it is the festival of weeks);
3. A Sabbath of months (inasmuch as *the seventh month* has both a festival and a fast, and with its first day begins the civil year);
4. A Sabbath of years (the seventh year is the sabbatical year); and,

5. A Sabbath of Sabbaths, inasmuch as *the seventh sabbatical year* is the jubilee. *SEE SABBATH.*

IV. Mode of Celebration. — As the observance of the jubilee, like that of the sabbatical year, was only to become obligatory when the Israelites had taken possession of the promised land, and cultivated the land for that period of years, at the conclusion of which the festival was to be celebrated, the ancient tradition preserved in the Talmud seems to be correct, that the first sabbatical year was in the one-and-twentieth, and the first jubilee in the sixty-fourth year after the Jews came into Canaan, for it took them seven years to conquer it, and seven years more to distribute it (*Erachin*, 12, 6; Maimonides, *Jobels* 10:2). The Bible says nothing about *the manner* in which the jubilee is to be celebrated, except that it should be proclaimed by the blast of a trumpeter *SEE TRUMPETER.* As in many other cases, the lawgiver leaves the practical application of this law, and the necessarily complicated arrangements connected therewith, to the elders of Israel. Now tradition tells us that the trumpets used on this occasion, like those of the feast of trumpets, or new year, were of rams' horns, straight, and had their mouth piece covered with gold (*Mishna, Rosh Ha-Shana*, 3, 2; Maimonides, *Jobel*, 10, 11); that every Israelite blew nine blasts, so as to make the trumpet literally "*sound throughout the land*" (~~Leviticus~~ Leviticus 25:9); and that "from the feast of trumpets, or new year (i.e. Tisri 1), till the day of atonement (i.e. Tisri 10), the slaves were neither manumitted to return to their homes nor made use of by their masters, but ate, drank, and rejoiced, and wore garlands on their heads; and when the day of atonement came the judges blew the trumpet, the slaves were manumitted to go to their homes, and the fields were set free" (*Rosh Ha-Shana*, 8 b; Maimonides, *Jobel*, 10, 14). Though the Jews, from the nature of the case, cannot now celebrate the jubilee, yet on the evening of the day of atonement the conclusion of the fast is announced in all the synagogues to the present day by the blast of the *Shophar* or horn, which, according to the Rabbins, is intended to commemorate the ancient jubilee proclamation (*Orach Chajim*, cap. 623, sec. 6, note).

Because the Bible does not record any particular instance of the public celebration of this festival, Michaelis, Winer, etc., have questioned whether the law of jubilee ever came into actual operation; while Kranold, Hupfeld, etc., have positively denied it. The following considerations, however, *speak* for its actual observance:

1. All the other Mosaic festivals have been observed, and it is therefore surpassing strange to suppose that the jubilee which is so organically connected with them, and is the climax of all of them, is the only one that never was observed.
2. The law about the inalienability of landed property, which was to be the result of the jubilee, actually obtained among the Jews, thus showing that this festival must have been observed. Hence it was with a view to observing the jubilee law that the right of an heiress to marry was restricted (⁴⁰⁸⁰Numbers 36:4, 6, 7); and it was the observance of this law, forbidding the sale of land in such a manner as to prevent its reversion to the original owner or his heir in the year of jubilee, that made Naboth refuse to part with his vineyard on the solicitation of king Ahab (⁴¹²⁰1 Kings 21:1-4).
3. From ³⁶⁶⁷Ezekiel 46:17, where even the king is reminded that if he made a present of his landed property to any of his servants it could only be to the jubilee year, when it must revert to him, it is evident that the jubilee was observed. Allusions to the jubilee are also to be found in ⁴⁶⁸⁰Nehemiah 5:1-19; ²³⁸⁰Isaiah 5:7, 8, 9, 10; 61:1, 2; ³⁰⁷²Ezekiel 7:12, 13 (²³⁷³Isaiah 37:30 is less clear). Ewald contends that the institution is eminently practical in the character of its details, and that the accidental circumstance of no particular instance of its observance having been recorded in the Jewish history proves nothing. Besides the passages to which reference has been made, he applies several others to the jubilee. He conceives that "the year of visitation" mentioned in ⁴⁴¹³Jeremiah 11:23; 23:12; 48:44, denotes the punishment of those who, in the jubilee, withheld by tyranny or fraud the possessions or the liberty of the poor. From ³⁴⁸⁶Jeremiah 32:6-12, he infers that the law was restored to operation in the reign of Josiah (*Alterthümer*, p. 424, note 1). It is likely, however, that in the general declension of religious observances under the later monarchs of Judah this institution yielded to the avarice and worldliness of landed proprietors, especially as mortgaged property and servants would thereby be released (see ²⁶⁴⁸Jeremiah 34:8-11; comp. ⁴⁶⁸⁰Nehemiah 5). Indeed, it is intimated that the Babylonian captivity should be of such a duration as to compensate for the years (sabbatical and jubilee together) of which Jehovah had thus been defrauded (⁴⁴⁸²2 Chronicles 36:21).
4. The general observance of the jubilee is attested by the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition. This unanimity of opinion, however, only extends to the observance of the jubilee prior to the Babylonian captivity, for many of

the later Rabbins affirm that it was not kept *after* the captivity. But in *the Seder Olam* (cap. 30), the author of which lived shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, we are positively assured that it was observed. Josephus, too (*Ant.* 3, 12, 3), speaks of it as being permanently observed. This is, moreover, confirmed by Diodorus Siculus (lib. 40), who tells us that the Jews cannot dispose of their own patrimony (ἴδιους κλήρους πωλεῖν), as well as by the fact that we have distinct records of the law respecting the redemption of houses in cities without walls, which forms an integral part of the jubilee law, being strictly observed to a very late period (*Erachin*, 31 b; *Baba Kama*, 82 b).

V. Origin, Design, and Importance of the Jubilee. — The foundation of the law of jubilee appears to be so essentially connected with the children of Israel that it seems strange that Michaelis should have confidently affirmed its Egyptian origin, while yet he acknowledges that he can produce no specific evidence on the subject (*Mos. Law*, art. 73). The only well proved instance of anything like it in other nations appears to be that of the Dalmatians, mentioned by Strabo, lib. 7 (p. 315, edit. Casaubon). He says that they redistributed their land every eight years. Ewald, following the statement of Plutarch, refers to the institution of Lycurgus; but Mr. Grote has given another view of the matter (*History of Greece*, 2, 530).

The object of this institution was that those of the people of God who, through poverty or other adverse circumstances, had forfeited their personal liberty or property to their fellow citizens, should have their debts forgiven by their coreligionists every half century, on the great day of atonement, and be restored to their families and inheritance as freely and fully as God on that very day forgave the debts of his people and restored them to perfect fellowship with himself, so that the whole community, having forgiven each other and being forgiven of God, might return to the original order which had been disturbed in the lapse of time, and, being freed from the bondage of one another, might unreservedly be the servants of him who is their redeemer. The aim of the jubilee, therefore, is to preserve unimpaired the essential character of the theocracy, to the end that there be no poor among the people of God (^(GENU)Deuteronomy 15:4). Hence God, who redeemed Israel from the bondage of Egypt to be his peculiar people, and allotted to them the promised land, will not suffer any one to usurp his title as Lord over those whom he owns as his own. It is the idea of grace for all the suffering children of man, bringing freedom to the captive and rest to the weary as well as to the earth, which made the

year of jubilee the symbol of the Messianic year of grace (^{2301D}Isaiah 61:2), when all the conflicts in the universe should be restored to their original harmony, and when not only we, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, but the whole creation, which groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, may be restored into the glorious liberty of the sons of God (comp. ²³⁰¹Isaiah 61:1-3, ⁴⁰²¹Luke 4:21; ⁴⁸⁸⁸Romans 8:18-23: ⁸⁰⁰⁹Hebrews 4:9).

The importance of this institution will be apparent if it is considered what moral and social advantages would accrue to the community from the sacred observance of it.

1. It would prevent the accumulation of land on the part of a few to the detriment of the community at large.
2. It would render it impossible for any one to be born to absolute poverty, since every one had his hereditary land.
3. It would preclude those inequalities which are produced by extremes of riches and poverty, and which make one man domineer over another.
4. It would utterly do away with slavery.
5. It would afford a fresh opportunity to those who were reduced by adverse circumstances to begin again their career of industry, in the patrimony which they had temporarily forfeited.
6. It would periodically rectify the disorders which crept into the state in the course of time, preclude the division of the people into nobles and plebeians, and preserve the theocracy inviolate.

VI. Literature. — The Mishna (*Erachin*, ch. 8, 9) gives very important enactments of a very ancient date respecting the jubilee. In Maimonides (*Jod Ha-Chezaka*, especially the tract so often above referred to as *Hilchoth Shemita Ve-Jobel*, ch. 10-13) an epitome will be found of the Jewish information on this subject which is scattered through the Talmud and Midrashim. Of the modern productions are to be mentioned the valuable treatises of Cunaeus, *De Rep. Hebr.* chap. 2, sec. 4 (in the *Critici Sacri*, 9:278 sq.), and Meyer, *De Tempor. et Diebus Hebroeorum* (in *Ugolini Thesaurus*, 1, 703, 1755), p. 341-360; Michaelis, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* (Engl. version, Lond. 1814), vol. 1, art. 83, p. 376 sq.; Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie* (Berl. 1825), 1, 502 sq; the

excellent prize essays of Kranold, *De Anno Hebr. Jubiloeo* (Götting. 1837), and Wolde, *De anno Hebr. Jubiloeo* (Göttingen, 1837); Bhhr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelberg, 1839), 1, 572 sq.; Ewald, *Die Alterthümer des Folkes Israel* (Götting. 1854), p. 415 sq.; Saalschitz, *Das Mosaische Recht* (Berlin, 1853), 1, 141, etc.; and *Archaologie der Hebraer* (Konigsb. 1856), 2, 224, etc.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1855), 1, 463, etc.; Keil, *Handbuch der Biblischen Archäologie* (Frankf. a. M. 1858), 1, 374, etc. Hupfeld (*Commentatio de Hebroeorum Festis*, part 3, 1852) has lately dealt with it in a willful and reckless style of criticism. Vitringa notices the prophetic bearing of the jubilee in lib. 4, c. 4 of the *Observationes Sacroe*. Lightfoot (*Harm. Evang. in Luc.* 4, 19) pursues the subject in a fanciful manner, and makes out that Christ suffered in a jubilee year. For further details, see Wagenseil, *De anno Jubiloeo Hebr.* (Altdorf, 1700); J.C. Buck, *De anno Hebroeor. jubiloeo* (Viteb. 1700); Carpzov, *De annojubiloeo* (Lips. 1730; also in his *Apparat. crit.* p. 447): Ode, *De anno Heb. jubilate* (Traj. a. K. 1736; also in Oelrich's *Collectio*, 2, 421-508); Laurich, *Legislatio Mosaica de anno semisecolari* (Altenb. 1794); also Marck, *Sylog. dissert.* 302; Bauer, *Gottesd. Verfass.* 2, 277; Hullmann, *Urgesch. des Staats*, 73; Van der Hardt, *Dejubil. Mosis* (Helmstadt, 1728); Jochanan Salomo, *De jubil. Hebr.* (Danz. 1679); Meier, *De mysterii Jobelcei* (Brem. 1700), Reineccius, *De origine Jubiloeorum* (Weissenfels, 1730); Stemler, *De anno Jobeleo* (Lips. 1730); Van Poorteren, *Jubilicus Hebroeorum* (Cob. 1730); Walther, *De Jubiloeo Judoeorum* (Sodin. 1762). Other monographs, relating, however, rather to later times, are cited by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 128, 162. **SEE SABBATICAL YEAR.**

Jubilee, Or Jubilee Year,

an institution of the Roman Catholic Church, the name of which is borrowed from that of the Jewish jubilee (see above). The Catholic jubilee is of two kinds, *ordinary* and *extraordinary*. The ordinary jubilee is that which is celebrated at stated intervals, the length of which has varied at different times. Its origin is traced to pope Boniface VIII, who issued, for the year 1300, a bull granting a plenary indulgence to all pilgrim visitors of Rome during that year on condition of their penitently confessing their sins, and visiting the church of St. Peter and St. Paul fifteen times if strangers, and thirty times if residents of the city. The invitation was accepted with marvelous enthusiasm. Innumerable troops of pilgrims from every part of the Church flocked to Rome. Giovanni Villani a contemporary chronicler,

states that the constant number of pilgrims in Rome, not reckoning those who were on the road going or returning, during the entire year, never fell below 200,000. Boniface, finding the jubilee a success, and having been informed, so the story goes, by a hoary patriarch, who, at the age of 107, attended it, that a hundred years ago a like jubilee had been held, now ordered that it should thereafter be held every hundredth year. The great gain which the occasion afforded to the churches at Rome induced Clement VI to abridge the time to fifty years. His jubilee accordingly took place in 1350, and was even more numerously attended than that of Boniface, the average number of pilgrims, until the heats of summer suspended their frequency, being, according to Matthew Villani, no fewer than 1,000,000! The term of interval was still further abridged by Urban VI; but in the stormy days of his pontificate the jubilee could not take place, and his successor, Boniface IX, improved this to his advantage, and ordered it to take place in 1390. Ten years later he repeated it, and, besides, instituted extra years of jubilee, and permitted their observance also in foreign cities provided the worshippers would pay into the Roman treasury the cost of a journey to the holy city (comp. Amort, *De origine, progressu, valore ac fructu indulgent.* 1, 87 sq.). Paul II finally ordered in 1470 that thenceforward every twenty-fifth year should be held as jubilee, an arrangement which has continued ever since to regulate the ordinary jubilee. As the indulgences could, by the payment of given sums and the contribution to ecclesiastical purposes, always be obtained at the home of the penitent, the pilgrimages to Rome gradually diminished in frequency; but the observance itself has been punctually maintained at each recurring period, with the single exception of the year 1800, in which, owing to the vacancy of the holy see and the troubles of the times, it was not held. For the excesses committed in the sale of indulgences, *SEE INDULGENCES*. The extraordinary jubilee is ordered by the pope out of the regular period, either on his accession, or on some occasion of public calamity, or in some critical condition of the fortunes of the Church; one of the conditions for obtaining the indulgence in such cases being the recitation of certain stated prayers for the particular necessity in which the jubilee originated. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7, 117; Chambers, s.v.; Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 334.

Jubilees, Book of.

This apocryphal or Hagadic book, which was used so largely in the ancient Church, and was still known to the Byzantines, but of which both the

original Hebrew and the Greek were afterwards lost, has recently been discovered in an Ethiopic version in Abyssinia.

I. *Title of the Book, and its Signification.* — The book is called Ἰωβηλαῖα = *twl bwrh rps*, "the Jubilees," or "the book of Jubilees," because it divides the period of the Biblical history upon which it treats, i.e. from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan, into fifty jubilees of forty-nine years each, equal to 2450 years, and carefully describes every event according to the jubilee, sabbatical year, or year in which it transpired, as stated in the inscription: "These are the words of the division of the days according to the law and the testimony, according to the events of the years in sabbatical years and in jubilees," etc. It is also called by the fathers ἡ λετὴ Γένεσις, λεπτοσγένεσις, μικρογένεσις, τὰ λεπτὰ Γενέσεως = *tyṣarb afwz*, i.e. *the small Genesis, compendium of Genesis*, because it only selects certain portions of Genesis, although through its lengthy comments upon these points it is actually longer than this canonical book (comp. Epiphanius, *Adv. Hoer.* lib. 1, tom. 3, cap. 6, edit. Petav.; G. Syncellus, p. 8); or, according to Ewald's rendering of it, τὰ λεπτὰ (*subtilia, minuta*) Γένεσις, because it divides the history upon which it treats into very minute and small periods (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1, 271); it is called by St. Jerome *the apocryphal Genesis* (see below, sec. 3), and it is also styled ἡ τοῦ Μωυσέως ἀποκάλυψις, *the Apocalypse of Moses*, by George Syncellus and Cedrenus, because the book pretends to be a revelation of God to Moses, and is denominated "the book of the division of days" by the Abyssinian Church, from the first words of the inscription.

II. *Design and Contents of the Book.* — This apocryphal book is designed to be a commentary on the canonical books of Genesis and Exodus.

(1) It fixes and arranges more minutely the chronology of the Biblical history from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan;

(2) Solves the various difficulties to be found in the narratives of these canonical books;

(3) Describes more fully events which are simply hinted at in the sacred history of that early period; and

(4) Expatiates upon the religious observances, such as the Sabbath, the festivals, circumcision, sacrifices, lawful and unlawful meats, etc., setting

forth their sacred character, as well as our duty to keep them, by showing the high antiquity of these institutions, inasmuch as they have been sacredly observed by the patriarchs, as may be seen from the following notice of these four points.

a. In its *chronological arrangements* we find that it places the deluge in A.M. 1353 (Jubil. 6, 61), and the exodus in the year A.M. 2410 (4, 10). This, with the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, yields fifty jubilees of forty-nine years each from the creation to the entrance into Canaan, i.e. 2450, and also allows a new jubilee period to commence immediately upon the entering of the Israelites into the Promised Land. Though in the calculations of this period the book of Jubilees agrees in its particulars with the Hebrew text of Genesis and Exodus, yet it differs from the canonical text both as to the time of the sojourn in Egypt and the years in which the ante and post-diluvian patriarchs begat their children. Thus Jared is said to have lived 62 instead of 162 years before Enoch was born, Methuselah was 67 instead of 187 at the birth of Lamech, and Lamech again was 53 instead of 182 when he begat Noah, agreeing partly with the Samaritan Pentateuch, and partly with the Septuagint in their statements about these antediluvian patriarchs. In the chronology of the post-diluvian patriarchs, however, the book of Jubilees deviates from these versions, and says that Arphaxad begat Cainan when 74-75; after the deluge, Cainan begat Salah when 57, Salah begat Eber when 67, Eber begat Peleg when 68, Peleg begat Reu when 61; the birth of Serug is omitted, but Serug is said to have begat Nahor in the year 116 after the birth of Reu, and Nahor begat Terah in his 62d year (compare Jubil. 4:40, etc.). The going down into Egypt is placed about A.M. 2172-2173 (Jubil. 45:1-3), so that when we deduct it from 2410, in which year the exodus is placed, there remains for the sojourn in Egypt 238 years. In the description of the lives of Noah, Abraham (23:23), Isaac (36:49-52), Jacob (45:40-43), and Joseph (46:9-15), the chronology agrees with the Hebrew text of Genesis.

b. Of *the difficulties* in the sacred narrative which the book of Jubilees tries to solve may be mentioned that it accounts for the serpent speaking to Eve by saying that all animals spoke before the fall in paradise (comp.

~~Gen.~~ Genesis 1:1 with Jubil. 3:98); explains very minutely whence the first heads of families took their wives (Jubi. 4, 24, 71, 100, etc.); how far the sentence of death pronounced in ~~Gen.~~ Genesis 2:17 has been fulfilled literally (4:99, etc.); shows that the sons of God who came to the daughters of men were angels (5:3); with what help Noah brought the animals into the ark

(5:76); wherewith the tower of Babel was destroyed (10:87); why Sarah disliked Ishmael and urged Abraham to send him away (17:13); why Rebecca loved Jacob so dearly (19:40-84); how it was that Esau came to sell his birthright for a mess of pottage (24:5-20); who told Rebekah (^{<0274>}Genesis 27:42) that Esau determined to kill Jacob (37:1, etc.); how it was that he afterwards desisted from his determination to kill Jacob (35:29-105); why Rebekah said (^{<0275>}Genesis 27:45) that she would be deprived of both her sons in one day (37:9); why Er, Judah's first born, died (41:1-7); why Onan would not redeem Tamar (41:11-13); why Judah was not punished for his sin with Tamar (41:57-67); why Joseph had the money put into the sacks of his brethren (42:71-73) and how Moses was nourished in the ark (47:13), and that it was not God, but the chief *mastemah*, **hmççæ**, *the enemy*, who hardened the hearts of the Egyptians (48:58).

c. Instances where *events* which are *briefly mentioned* or *simply hinted at* in the canonical book of Genesis, and which seem to refer to another narrative of an earlier or later date, are given more fully in the book of Jubilees, will be found in Jubil. 16:39-101, where an extensive description is given of the appearance of the angels to Abraham and Sarah as a supplement to ^{<0184>}Genesis 18:14; in Jubil. 32:5-38, 50-53, where Jacob is described as giving tithes of all his possessions, and wishing to erect a house of Good in Bethel, which is a fuller description of that hinted at in ^{<0182>}Genesis 28:22; in Jubil. 34:4-25, where Jacob's battle with the seven kings of the Amorites is described, to which allusion is made in ^{<0182>}Genesis 48:22.

d. As to *the religious observances*, we are told that the *Feast of Weeks*, or *Pentecost* (**μyṛwkbhμwyμ gj tw[wbçμ rygqh**), is contained in the covenants which God made with Noah and Abraham (comp. Jubil. 6:5660 with ^{<0108>}Genesis 9:8-17; 14:51-54 with ^{<0158>}Genesis 15:18-21); *the Feast of Tabernacles* was first celebrated by Abraham at Beersheba (Jubil. 16:61-101); *the concluding Festival* (**trx[ynymç**), which is on the 23d of Tisri, continuing *the Feast of Tabernacles*, **SEE FESTIVAL**, was instituted by Jacob (Jubil. 32:87-94) after his vision at Bethel (^{<0139>}Genesis 35:9-14); and that the mourning on *the Day of Atonement* (**rypkμwy**) was instituted (^{<0169>}Leviticus 16:29) to commemorate the mourning of Jacob over the loss of Joseph (Jubil. 34:50-60).

(The German version by Dillmann, through which this book has recently been made known to Europeans, has been divided by the erudite translator into *fifty chapters*, but not into verses. The references in this article are to those chapters, and *the lines* of the respective chapters.)

III. Author and Original Language of the Book. — That the author of this book was a Jew is evident from,

- (1) His minute description of the Sabbath and festivals, as well as all the Rabbinic ceremonies connected therewith (1:19-33, 49-60), which developed themselves in the course of time, and which we are told are simply types described by Moses from heavenly archetypes, and have not only been kept by the angels in heaven, but are binding upon the Jews world without end;
- (2) The elevated position he ascribes to the Jewish people (2:79-91; 16:50-56); ordinary Israelites are in dignity equal to angels (15:72-75), and the priests are like the presence angels (31:47-49); over Israel only does the Lord himself rule, while he appointed evil spirits to exercise dominion over all other nations (15:80-90); and
- (3) The many Hagadic elements of this book which are still preserved in the Talmud and Midrashim. Compare, for instance, Jubil. 1:116, where the presence angel, *ʿwrffmymnph rç*, is described as having preceded the hosts of Israel, with *Sanhedrim*, 38, b; the description of the creation of paradise on *the third day* (Jubil. 2:37 with *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 15); the twenty-two generations from Adam to Jacob (Jubil. 2:64, 91, with *Bereshith Rabba* and *Midrash Tadshe*, 169); the animals speaking before the fall (Jubil. 3:98 with the Midrashim); the remark that Adam lived 70 years less than 1000 years in order that the declaration might be fulfilled "in the day in which thou eatest thereof thou shalt die," since 1000 years are as one day with the Lord (Jubil. 4:99 with *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 19; Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 278, ed. Otto); the causes of the deluge (Jubil. 5:5-20 with *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 31); the declaration that the beginning of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months are to be celebrated as festivals, being the beginning of the four seasons called *twpqt*, and having already been observed by Noah (Jubil. 6:31-95 with *Pirke R. Eliezer*, cap. 8; Pseudo-Jonathan on ^{<10822>}Genesis 8:22); the statement that Satan induced God to ask Abraham to sacrifice his son (Jubil. 17:49-53 with *Sanhedrim*, 89, b); that Abraham was tempted ten times (Jubil. 19:22 with *Mishna, Aboth*, 5;

Targum Jerusalem on ^{<021>}Genesis 22:1, etc.); and that Joseph spoke Hebrew when he made himself known to his brothers (Jubil. 43:54 with *Bereshith Rabba*, cap. 93). As, however, some of the practices, rites, and interpretations given in this book are at variance with the traditional expositions of the Rabbins, Beer is of opinion that the writer was a *Dosithean* who was anxious to bring about a fusion of Samaritanism and Rabbinic-Judaism by making mutual concessions (*Das Buch d. Jubilaen*, p. 61, 62); Jellinek, again, thinks that he was an *Essene*, and wrote this book against the Pharisees, who maintained that the beginning of the month is to be fixed by observation and not by calculation (yp I [çdhh vwdyq hyarh), and that the Sanhedrim had the power of ordaining intercalary years, *SEE HILLEL II*, adducing in corroboration of this view the remark in Jubil. 6:95-133, the chronological system of the author, which is based upon heptades; and the strict observance of the Sabbath, which, as an Essene loving the sacred number seven, he urges upon every Israelite (compare Jubil. 2:73-135; 4:19-61; *Beth ha-Midrash*, 3, p. 11); while Frankel maintains that the writer was an Egyptian Jew, and a priest at the temple in Leontopolis, which accounts for his setting such a high value upon sacrifices, and tracing the origin of the festivals and sacrifices to the patriarchs (*Monatsschrift*, 5, p. 396).

Notwithstanding the difference of opinion as to which phase of Judaism the author belonged, all agree that this book was written in Hebrew, that it was afterwards translated into Greek, and that the Ethiopic, of which Dillmann has given a German version, was made from the Greek. Many of the expressions in the book can only be understood by retranslating them into Hebrew. Thus, for instance, the remarks "und es gibt keine Uebergehung" (Jubil. 6:101, 102), "und sie sollen keinen Tag uebergehen" (6:107), become intelligible when we bear in mind that the original had rwyb[, *intercalation*. Moreover, the writer designates the wives of the patriarchs from the family of Seth by names which express beauty and virtue in Hebrew; Seth married Azurah, hrwx[, *restraint*; Jared married Beracha, hkrb, *blessing*; Enoch and Methuselah married wives of the name of Adni, hnd[, *pleasure*; while Cain married his sister Avan,]wa; *vice* (Jubil. 4:24-128). The words yt [bçn yb, ^{<0226>}Genesis 22:16, are rendered in the book of Jubil. (17:42) *bei meinem Haupte*, which is the well known Palestinian oath! çar yçar yyj b (compare *Sanhedrin*, 2, 3, al.), and which no Greek writer would use, especially as the Sept. does not have it

here. There are also other renderings which show that the writer had the Hebrew Scriptures before him and not the Sept., a fact which is irreconcilable on the supposition that he was a Greek Jew, or wrote in Greek, as he would undoubtedly have used the Sept. Thus, for instance, the book of Jubil. 14:9,10, has "der aus deinem Liebe hervorgeht," which is a literal translation of the Hebrew יֵצֵא מִלִּבִּי אֶת רִצְוֹ, ^{<01504>}Genesis 15:4; otherwise the Sept. ὅς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ: Jubil. 14:29 has "aber Abram wehrte sie ab," so the Hebrew, רַבְּאָמֶת/א בְּנֵי (^{<01511>}Genesis 15:11), not the Sept. καὶ συνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς Ἄβραμ (comp. also book of Jubil. 15:17 with Sept. ^{<0177>}Genesis 17:7; 15:43 with Sept. 17:17; 15:46 with Sept. 17:19). To these is to be added the testimony of St. Jerome, who remarks upon hSræ "Hoc verbum, quantum memoria suggerit, nusquam alibi in scripturis sanctis apud Hebraeos invenisse me novi, absque libro apocrypho, qui a Graecis μικρογένεσις appellatur. Ibi in aedificatione turris pro stadio ponitur, in quo excercentur pugiles et athletae et cursorum velocitas comprobatur" (comp. *In epistola ad Fabiolam de mansionibus*, Mansio 18 on ^{<0821>}Numbers 33:21, 22); and again (Mansio 24 on ^{<0827>}Numbers 33:27, 28), "Hoc eodem vocabulo (j yī) et iisdem literis scriptum invenio patrem Abraham, qui in supradicto apocrypho Geneseos volumine abactis corvis, qui hominum frumenta vastabant, abactoris vel depulsoris sortitus est nomen;" as well as the fact that portions of the book are still extant in Hebrew (comp. Jellinek, *Beth Ha-Midrash*, vol. 3, p. 9, etc.). The agreement of many passages with the Sept., when the latter deviates from the Hebrew, is, as Dillmann observes, to be ascribed to the translator, who, when rendering it into Greek, used the Sept. (Ewald, *Jahrbuch*, 3, 90).

IV. Date and Importance of the Book. — That this book was written before the destruction of the Temple is evident not only from its description of the sacrifices and the services performed therein, but from its whole complexion, and this is admitted by all who have written on it. Its exact date, however, is a matter of dispute. Kruger maintains that it was written between B.C. 332 and 320; Dillmann and Frankel think that it was written *in the first century before Christ*; while Ewald is of opinion that it originated about *the birth of Christ*. The medium of the two extremes is the most probable.

The importance of this book can hardly be overrated when we remember that it is one of the very few Biblical works which have come down to us

written between the close of the O.T. canon and the beginning of the N.T. There are, however, several other considerations which render this book a most important contribution, both to the interpretation of the Bible and to the history of Jewish belief anterior to the Christian era.

1. Many portions of it are literal translations of the book of Genesis, and therefore enable us to see in what state the Hebrew text was at that age, and furnish us with some readings which are preferable to those given in *the textus receptus*, e.g. Jubil. 17:17 renders it probable that the correct reading of ^{<0211>}Genesis 21:11 is | [w wnb tda | [wtma tda, which is corroborated by the verse immediately following.
2. It shows us that the Jews of that age believed in the survival of the soul after the death of the body (23:115). though *the resurrection* of the body is nowhere mentioned therein; that they believed in the existence of Satan, the prince of legions of evil spirits, respecting which so little is said in the O. Test. and so much in the New; and that these evil spirits have dominion over men, and are often the cause of their illnesses and death (10:35-47; 49:7-10).
3. It shows us what the Jews believed about the coming of the Messiah, and the great day of judgment (33:37-118).
4. It explains the statements in ^{<4075>}Acts 7:53; Galatians 3, 19; ^{<5012>}Hebrews 2:2, which have caused so much difficulty to interpreters, by most distinctly declaring that the law was given through *the presence angel* (1:99-102).
5. It even appears to be quoted in the N.T. (compare ^{<5014>}2 Peter 2:4; ^{<5006>}Jude 6, with Jubil. 4:76; 5, 3, 20).

V. Literature. — It has already been remarked that the Hebrew original of this book is lost. Chapters 34 and 35 are, however, preserved from *Midrash Vujisau*, in *Midrash Jalkut Sabbat*. section *Bereshith*, 133, as has been pointed out by Jellinek (see below); and Treuenfels has shown parallels between other parts of the book of Jubilees and the Hagada and Midrashim in the *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1846, p. 81 sq. The Greek version of this book, which was made at a very early period of the Christian era, as is evident from Clement's *Recognit.* cap. 30-32, though Epiphanius (*Adv. Hoeres.* lib. 1, cap. 4, 6; lib. 2; tom. 2, cap. 83, 84) and St. Jerome (*in Epistola ad Fabiolanz de mansionibus*, Mansio 18 on

^{Q8321}Numbers 33:21, 22; Mausio 24 on ^{Q8327}Numbers 33:27, 28) are the first who mention it by name, was soon lost in the Western Church, but it still existed in the Eastern Church, and was copiously used in the *Chronographia* of Georgius Syncellus and Georgius Cedrenus, and quoted several times by Joannes Zonaras and Michael Glycas, Byzantine theologians and historians of the 11th and 12th centuries (compare Fabricius, *Codex Pseud.-epigraph. V. Test.* p. 851-863; Dillmann, in Ewald's *Jahrbuech.* 3, 94 sq.). From that time, however, the Greek version was also lost, and the book of Jubilees was quite unknown to Europeans till 1844, when Ewald announced in the *Zeitschrift fur die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, p. 176-179, that Dr. Krapff had found it preserved in the Abyssinian church in an Ethiopic translation, and brought over a MS. copy which was made over to the Tübingen University. This Ethiopic version was translated into German by Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, 2, 230-256, and 3, 1-96 (Göttingen, 1849-51), and Ewald at once used its contents for the new edition of his *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel* (vol. 1, Götting. 1851, p. 271; vol. 2, 1853, p. 294). This was seasonably followed by Jellinek's edition of the *Midrash Vajisau*, with an erudite preface in *Beth Ha-Midrash*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1855); next by the learned treatises of Beer, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim*, 1856; and Frankel, *Das Buch d. Jubilaen* (in the *Monatsschrift. f. Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 5, 311-316, 380-400); then by another masterly production by Beer, entitled *Noch ein Wort über das Buch der Jubilaen* (in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1857); and strictures on the works of Jellinek, Beer, and Frankel, by Dillmann, in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*, 11 (Leipzig, 1857), 161 sq. Kruger, too, published an article on *Die Chronologie im Buche der Jubilaen* in the same journal, 12 (Lpz. 1858), 279 sq., and Dillmann at last published the Ethiopic itself (Kiel and Lond. 1859), which Ronsch has since translated with notes (Leips. 1874, 8vo).

Ju'cal

(²⁸⁰¹Jeremiah 38:1). *SEE JEHUCAL.*

Ju'da

(Ἰούδα, merely the Genitive case of Ἰούδας, the Graecized form of *Judah*), an incorrect Anglicizing of the name JUDAS or JUDAH in several passages of the Auth. Vers. *SEE JUDE.*

1. The patriarch JUDAH, Son of Jacob (Susan. 56; ^{<4183>}Luke 3:33; ^{<874>}Hebrews 7:14; ^{<6185>}Revelation 5:5; 7:5). For the "city of Juda" (i.e. the tribe of Judah), in ^{<413>}Luke 1:39, *SEE JUTTAH*.
2. The son of Joseph, and father of Simeon, in Christ's maternal ancestry (^{<4180>}Luke 3:30); probably the same with ADAIAH, the father of Maaseiah, which latter was one of the Jewish centurions who aided Jehoiada in restoring Joash to the throne (^{<4201>}2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. ante 876. *SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST*.
3. The son of Joanna, and father of Joseph (^{<4185>}Luke 3:26), another of Christ's maternal ancestors; probably identical with ABIUD, the father of Eliakim, among Christ's paternal ancestry (^{<4013>}Matthew 1:13); and likewise with OBADIAH, the son of Aman, and father of Shechaniah (^{<4321>}1 Chronicles 3:21). B.C. ante 406. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 16, 17.)
4. One of the Lord's brethren, enumerated in ^{<4018>}Mark 6:3. *SEE JOSES*; *SEE JOSEPH*. On the question of his identity with Jude, the brother of James, one of the twelve apostles (^{<4166>}Luke 6:16; ^{<4013>}Acts 1:13), and with the author of the general epistle, *SEE JAMES*. In ^{<4135>}Matthew 13:55, his name is given more correctly in the A. Vers. as JUDAH.

Juda (Or Juda) Leo.

SEE JUDAH LEO.

Judae'a

(*Ἰουδαία*, fem. Of *Ἰουδαῖος*, *Jew* or *Jewish*, sc. land; once in A.V. for Chald. *dWhy*] *Judah*, ^{<4518>}Ezra 5:8; "Jewry," ^{<4215>}Luke 23:5; ^{<4701>}John 7:1), the southernmost of the three divisions of the Holy Land. It denoted the kingdom of Judah as distinguished from that of Israel. *SEE JUDAH*. But after the captivity, as most of the exiles who returned belonged to the kingdom of Judah, the name Judaea (Judah) was applied generally to the whole of Palestine west of the Jordan (^{<3701>}Haggai 1:1, 14; 2, 2). Under the Romans, in the time of Christ, Palestine was divided into Galilee, Samaria, and Judaea (^{<4104>}John 4:4, 5; ^{<4031>}Acts 9:31), the last including the whole of the southern part west of the Jordan. But this division was only observed as a political and local distinction, for the sake of indicating the part of the country, just as we use the name of a county (^{<4111>}Matthew 2:1, 5; 3, 1;

4:25; ^{<4016>}Luke 1:65); but when the whole of Palestine was to be indicated in a general way, the term Judaea was still employed. Thus persons in Galilee and elsewhere spoke of going to Judaea (^{<4018>}John 7:3; 11:7), to distinguish the part of Palestine to which they were proceeding; but when persons in Rome and other places spoke of Judea (^{<4021>}Acts 28:21), they used the word as a general denomination for the country of the Jews, or Palestine. Indeed, the name seems to have had a more extensive application than even to Palestine west of the Jordan. It denoted all the dominions of Herod the Great, who was called the king of Judaea; and much of these lay beyond the river (comp. ^{<4001>}Matthew 19:1, ^{<4101>}Mark 10:1). After the death of Herod, however, the Judaea to which his son Archelaus succeeded was only the southern province so called (^{<4122>}Matthew 2:22), which afterwards became a Roman province dependent on Syria and governed by procurators, and this was its condition during our Lord's ministry (see Nohrbor, *Judoea provincia Romanorum*, Upsal. 1822). It was afterwards for a time partly under the dominion of Herod Agrippa the elder (^{<4111>}Acts 12:1-19), but on his death it reverted to its former condition under the Romans. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.

It is only Judaea, in the provincial sense, that requires our present notice, the country at large being described in the article PALESTINE. In this sense, however, it was much more extensive than the domain of the tribe of Judah, even more so than the kingdom of the same name. There are no materials for describing its limits with precision, but it included the ancient territories of Judah, Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, and part of Ephraim. It is, however, not correct to describe Idumaea as not anciently belonging to Judah. The Idumaea of later times, or that which belonged to Judaea, was the southern part of the ancient Judah, into which the Idumaeans had intruded during the exile, and the annexation of which to Judea only restored what had anciently belonged to it.

The name Judea occurs among the list of nations represented at the paschal outpouring of the Holy Spirit (^{<4113>}Acts 2:9), where some have preferred the various readings *India* or *Idumoea* (see Kuinol, ad loc.), and even *Junia* (Ἰουνία, Schulthess, *De charismat.* 1, 145), a place in Armenia, with various other conjectural emendations (see Bowyer's *Conjectures on the N.T.* ad loc.), all alike unnecessary (see Hackett, Alford, ad loc.).

In the Rabbinical writings, Judaea, as a division of Palestine, is frequently called "the south," or "the south country," to distinguish it from Galilee,

which was called "the north" (Lightfoot, *Chorog. Cent.* 12). The distinction of the tribe of Judah into "the Mountain," "the Plain," and "the Vale," which we meet with in the Old Testament (^{<04130>}Numbers 13:30), was preserved under the more extended denomination of Judea (for the more specific divisions in ^{<0652>}Joshua 15:21-63, see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 93-122). The *Mountain*, or hill country of Judaea (^{<06211>}Joshua 21:11; ^{<04139>}Luke 1:39), was that "broad back of mountains," as Lightfoot calls it (*Chorog. Cent.* 11), which fills the center of the country from Hebron northward to beyond Jerusalem (for ^{<04139>}Luke 1:39, **SEE JUTTAH**). The *Plain* was the low country towards the sea coast, and seems to have included not only the broad plain which extends between the sea and the hill country, but the lower parts of the hilly region itself in that direction. Thus the Rabbins allege that from Beth-horon to the sea is one region (Talmud Hieros. *Shebi'ith*, 9:2). The *Vale* is defined by the Rabbins as extending from Engedi to Jericho (Lightfoot, *Panergon*, § 2); from which, and other indications, it seems to have included such parts of the Ghor, or great plain of the Jordan, as lay within the territory of Judaea. This appropriation of the terms is far preferable to that of some writers, such as Lightfoot, who suppose "the Plain" to be the broad valley of the Jordan, and "the Valley" to be the lower valley of the same river. That which is called *the Wilderness of Judaea* was the wild and inhospitable region lying eastward of Jerusalem, in the direction of the Jordan and Dead Sea (^{<02401>}Isaiah 40:3; ^{<04011>}Matthew 3:1; ^{<04080>}Luke 1:80; 3:2-4). In the N.T. only the *Highlands* and the *Desert* of Judaea are distinguished. We may have some notion of the extent northward which Judaea had obtained, from Josephus calling Jerusalem the center of the country (War, 3, 3, 5), which is remarkable, seeing that Jerusalem was originally in the northernmost border of the tribe of Judah. In fact, he describes the breadth of the country as extending from the Jordan to Joppa which shows that this city was in Judaea. How much further to the north — the boundary — lay we cannot know with precision, as we are unacquainted with the site of Annath, otherwise Borceros, which he says lay on the boundary in between Judaea and Samaria. The mere fact that Josephus makes Jerusalem the center of the land seems to prove that the province did not extend so far to the south as the ancient kingdom of the same name. As the southern boundary of Judea was also that of the whole country, it is only necessary to remark that Josephus places the southern boundary of the Judaea of the time of Christ at a village called Jardan, on the confines of Arabia Petraea. No place of this name has been found, and the indication is very indistinct,

from the fact that all the country which lay beyond the Idumaea of those times was then called Arabia. In fixing this boundary, Josephus regards Idumaea as part of Judaea, for he immediately after reckons that as one of the eleven districts into which Judaea was divided. Most of these districts were denominated, like our counties, from the chief towns. They were,

1. Jerusalem;
2. Gophna;
3. Acrabatta;
4. Thumna;
5. Lydda;
6. Emmaus;
7. Pella;
8. Idumaea;
9. Engaddi;
10. Herodium; and,
11. Jericho.

Judaea is, as the above intimations would suggest, a country full of hills and valleys. The hills are generally separated from one another by valleys and torrents, and are, for the most part, of moderate height, uneven, and seldom of any regular figure. The rock of which they are composed is easily converted into soil, which being arrested by the terraces when washed down by the rains, renders the hills cultivable in a series of long, narrow gardens, formed by these terraces from the base upwards. In this manner the hills were in ancient times cultivated most industriously, and enriched and beautified with the fig tree, the olive tree, and the vine; and it is thus that the scanty cultivation which still subsists is now carried on. But when the inhabitants were rooted out, and the culture neglected. the terraces fell to decay, and the soil which had been collected, in them was washed down into the valleys, leaving only the arid rock, naked and desolate. This is the general character of the scenery; but in some parts the hills are beautifully wooded, and in others the application of the ancient mode of cultivation still suggests to the traveler how rich the country once was and might be again, and how beautiful the prospects which it offered. As, however, much of this was the result of cultivation, the country was probably anciently, as at present, *naturally* less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travelers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately about Jerusalem, is barren and

desolate. But the prospect brightens as soon as you quit it, and Samaria and Galilee still smile like the land of promise." But there is a season — after the spring rains, and before the summer heat has absorbed all the moisture left by them — when even the desert is clothed with verdure, and at that season the valleys of Judaea present a refreshingly green appearance. This vernal season, however, is of short duration, and by the beginning of May the grass upon the mountains, and every vestige of vegetation upon the lower grounds, have in general completely disappeared. (See Kitto, *Pictorial History of Palestine*, Introduct. p. 39, 40, 119, 120; and the *Travels* of Nau, p. 439; Roger, p. 182; Mariti, 2, 362; Lindsay, 2, 70; Stephens, 2, 249; Elliot, p. 408, 409; Olin, 2, 323; Stanley, p. 161, 173. For a general discussion, see Reland, *Palest.* p. 31, 174, 178; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* 2, 2, 149; Ritter, *Erdk.* 14, 81, 1064, 1080, 1088; 15, 25, 125, 131, 655; 16, 1 sq., 21 sq., 33 sq., 35 sq., 509 sq., 26, 114 sq., 547.) **SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.**

Ju'dah

(Heb. *Yehudah'*, **hdWhy**] *celebrated*; comp. ^{<0235>}Genesis 29:35; 49:8, Chald. **dWhy**] *Yehud'*, ^{<1808>}Ezra 5:1; 7:14; ^{<0225>}Daniel 2:25; 5:13, 6:13; "Judaea," ^{<1808>}Ezra 5:8; "Jewry," ^{<0253>}Daniel 5:13; Sept. and N.T. generally **Ἰούδα** [as also Josephus]; but comp. **Ἰούδα**, ^{<0126>}Luke 3:26, 30; for ^{<0139>}Luke 1:39, **SEE JUTTAH**), the name of several persons, etc., in Scripture. **SEE JUDAS; SEE JUDE.**

1. The fourth son of Jacob by Leah, born B.C. 1916 (^{<0235>}Genesis 29:35), being the last before the temporary cessation in the births of her children. His whole brothers were Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, elder than himself — Issachar and Zebulun younger (see ^{<0353>}Genesis 35:23). The name is explained as having originated in Leah's exclamation of "praise" at this fresh gift of Jehovah — "She said, 'Now will I praise (**hd/a**, *odeh*) Jehovah,' and she called his name Yehudah" (^{<0235>}Genesis 29:35). The same play is preserved in the blessing of Jacob — "Judah, thou whom thy brethren shall praise!" (^{<0408>}Genesis 49:8).

The narrative in Genesis brings this patriarch more before the reader, and makes known more of his history and character than it does in the case of any other of the twelve sons of Jacob, with the single exception of Joseph. It was Judah's advice that the brethren followed when they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites instead of taking his life. By the light of his subsequent

actions we can see that his conduct on this occasion arose from a generous impulse, although the form of the question he put to them has been sometimes held to suggest an interested motive: "What profit is it if we slay our brother and conceal his blood? Come, let us sell him" (⁽⁻⁰¹³⁷²⁾Genesis 37:26, 27). Though not the first born, he "prevailed above his brethren" (⁽⁻¹³⁸²⁾1 Chronicles 5:2), and we find him subsequently taking a decided lead in all the affairs of the family. When a second visit to Egypt for corn had become inevitable, it was Judah who, as the mouthpiece of the rest, headed the remonstrance against the detention of Benjamin by Jacob, and finally undertook to be responsible for the safety of the lad (⁽⁻⁰¹⁴³⁸⁾Genesis 43:3-10). When, through Joseph's artifice, the brothers were brought back to the palace, he is again the leader and spokesman of the band. In that thoroughly Oriental scene it is Judah who unhesitatingly acknowledges the guilt which had never been committed, throws himself on the mercy of the supposed Egyptian prince, offers himself as a slave, and makes that wonderful appeal to the feelings of their disguised brother which renders it impossible for Joseph any longer to conceal his secret (⁽⁻⁰¹⁴¹⁴⁾Genesis 44:14, 16-34). So, too, it is Judah who is sent before Jacob to smooth the way for him in the land of Goshen (⁽⁻⁰¹⁴⁵⁸⁾Genesis 46:28). This ascendancy over his brethren is reflected in the last words addressed to him by his father — Thou whom thy brethren shall praise! thy father's sons shall bow down before thee! unto him shall be the gathering of the people (⁽⁻⁰¹⁴¹⁴⁾Genesis 49:8-10). In the interesting traditions of the Koran and the Midrash his figure stands out in the same prominence. Before Joseph his wrath is mightier and his recognition heartier than the rest. It is he who hastens in advance to bear to Jacob the fragrant robe of Joseph (Weil's *Biblical Legends*, p. 88-90).

Not long after the sale of Joseph, Judah had withdrawn from the paternal tents, and gone to reside at Adullam, in the country which afterwards bore his name. Here he married a woman of Canaan, called Shuah, and had by her three sons. Er, Onan, and Shelah. When the eldest of these sons became of fit age, he was married to a woman named Tamar, but soon after died. *SEE ER*. As he died childless, the patriarchal law, afterwards adopted into the Mosaic code (⁽⁻⁰²⁵¹⁶⁾Deuteronomy 25:6), required Judah to bestow upon the widow his second son. This he did; but as Onan also soon died childless *SEE ONAN*, Judah became reluctant to bestow his only surviving son upon this woman, and put her off with the excuse that he was not yet of sufficient age. Tamar accordingly remained in her father's house

at Adullam. She had the usual passion of Eastern women for offspring, and could not endure the stigma of having been twice married without bearing children, while the law precluded her from contracting any alliance but that which Judah withheld her from completing. Meanwhile Judah's wife died, and, after the time of mourning had expired, he went, accompanied by his friend Hirah, to attend the shearing of his sheep at Timnath, in the same neighborhood. These circumstances suggested to Tamar the strange thought of connecting herself with Judah himself, under the guise of a loose woman. Having waylaid him on the road to Timnath, she succeeded in her object, and when the consequences began to be manifest in the person of Tamar, Judah was highly enraged at her crime, and, exercising the powers which belonged to him as the head of the family she had dishonored, he commanded her to be brought forth, and committed to the flames as an adulteress. But when she appeared she produced the ring, the bracelet, and the staff which he had left in pledge with her, and put him to confusion by declaring that they belonged to the father of her coming offspring. *SEE TAMAR*. Judah acknowledged them to be his, and confessed that he had been wrong in withholding Shelah from her. The result of this painful affair was the birth of two sons, Zerah and Pharez (B.C. cir. 1893), from whom, with Shelah, the tribe of Judah descended. Pharez was the ancestor of the line from which David, the kings of Judah, and Jesus came (Genesis 38; 46:12; ~~1~~1 Chronicles 2:3-5; ~~1~~Matthew 1:3; ~~1~~Luke 3:33). These circumstances seem to have disgusted Judah with his residence in towns, for we find him ever afterwards at his father's tents. His experience of life, and the strength of his character, appear to have given him much influence with Jacob; and it was chiefly from confidence in him that the aged father at length consented to allow Benjamin to go down to Egypt. That this confidence was not misplaced has already been shown, *SEE JOSEPH*; and there is not in the whole range of literature a finer piece of true natural eloquence than that in which Judah offers himself to remain as a bond slave in the place of Benjamin, for whose safe return he had made himself responsible to his father. The strong emotions which it raised in Joseph disabled him from keeping up longer the disguise he had hitherto maintained, and there are few who have read it without being, like him, moved even to tears (~~1~~Genesis 44:14-34). B.C. 1874. *SEE JACOB*.

We hear nothing more of Judah till he received, along with his brothers, the final blessing of his father, which was conveyed in lofty language, glancing

far into futurity, and strongly indicative of the high destinies which awaited the tribe that was to descend from him (⁽⁻⁰⁴⁰⁸⁾Genesis 49:8-12). B.C. 1856.
SEE SHILOH.

Judah, Tribe And Territory Of.

I. *Historical Memoranda.* —

1. Judah's sons were five. Of these, three were by his Canaanitish wife Bathshua; they are all insignificant; two died early, and the third, Shelah, does not come prominently forward either in his person or his family. The other two, Pharez and Zerah — twins — were illegitimate sons by the widow of Er, the eldest of the former family. As is not unfrequently the case, the illegitimate sons surpassed the legitimate, and from Pharez, the elder, were descended the royal and other illustrious families of Judah. These sons were born to Judah while he was living in the same district of Palestine, which, centuries after, was repossessed by his descendants — amongst villages which retain their names unaltered in the catalogues of the time of the conquest. The three sons went with their father into Egypt at the time of the final removal thither (⁽⁻⁰⁴⁶²⁾Genesis 46:12; ⁽⁻⁰⁰⁰²⁾Exodus 1:2).
SEE JACOB.

2. When we again meet with the families of Judah they occupy a position among the tribes similar to that which their progenitor had taken amongst the patriarchs. At the time that the Israelites quitted Egypt, it already exhibited the elements of its future distinction in a larger population than any of the other tribes possessed (⁽⁻⁰⁰²⁶⁾Numbers 1:26, 27). It numbered 74,000 adult males, being nearly 12,000 more than Dan the next in point of numbers, and 34,100 more than Ephraim, which in the end contested with it the superiority among the tribes. During the sojourn in the wilderness, Judah neither gained, like some tribes, nor lost like others.

Its numbers had increased to 76,500, being 12,100 more than Issachar, which had become next to it in population (⁽⁻⁰³⁵²⁾Numbers 26:22). The chief of the tribe at the former census was Nahshon, the son of Amminadab (⁽⁻⁰⁰⁰⁷⁾Numbers 1:7; 2:3; 7:12; 10:14), an ancestor of David (⁽⁻⁰⁰⁰²⁾Ruth 4:20). Its representative amongst the spies, and also amongst those appointed to partition the land, was the great Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (⁽⁻⁰⁴³⁶⁾Numbers 13:6; 34:19). During the march through the desert Judah's place was in the van of the host, on the east side of the tabernacle, with his kinsmen Issachar and Zebulun (2:3-9; 10:14). The traditional standard of the tribe

was a lion's whelp, with the words, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered! (Targ. Pseudojon. on ^{<041B>}Numbers 2:3.)

3. During the conquest of the country the only incidents specially affecting the tribe of Judah are, (1) the misbehavior of Achan, who was of the great house of Zerah (^{<0410>}Joshua 7:1, 16-18); and (2) the conquest of the mountain district of Hebron by Caleb, and of the strong city Debir, in the same locality, by his nephew and son-in-law Othniel (^{<0446>}Joshua 14:6-15; 15:13-19). It is the only instance given of a portion of the country being expressly reserved for the person or persons who conquered it. In general the conquest seems to have been made by the whole community, and the territory allotted afterwards, without reference to the original conquerors of each locality. In this case the high character and position of Caleb, and perhaps a claim established by him at the time of the visit of the spies to "the land whereon his feet had trodden" (^{<0449>}Joshua 14:9; comp. ^{<0444>}Numbers 14:24), may have led to the exception.

4. The history of the Judges contains fewer facts respecting this important tribe than might be expected. It seems, however, to have been usually considered that the birthright which Reuben forfeited had passed to Judah under the blessing of Jacob; and a sanction was given to this impression when, after the death of Joshua, the divine oracle nominated Judah to take precedence of the other tribes in the war against the Canaanites (^{<0400>}Judges 1:2). It does not appear that any tribe was disposed to dispute the superior claim of Judah on its own account except Ephraim, although in doing this Ephraim had the support of other tribes. Ephraim appears to have rested its claims to the leadership of the tribes upon the ground that the house of Joseph, whose interest it represented, had received the birthright, or double portion of the eldest, by the adoption of the two sons of Joseph, who became the founders of *two* tribes in Israel. The existence of the sacerdotal establishment at Shiloh, in Ephraim, was doubtless' also alleged by the tribe as a ground of superiority over Judah. When; therefore, Judah assumed the scepter in the person of David, and when the sacerdotal establishment was removed to Jerusalem, Ephraim could not brook the eclipse it had sustained, and took the first opportunity of erecting a separate throne, and forming separate establishments for worship and sacrifice. Perhaps the separation of the kingdoms may thus be traced to the rivalry of Judah and Ephraim. After that separation the rivalry was between the two kingdoms, but it was still popularly considered as representing the ancient rivalry of these great tribes; for the prophet, in foretelling the repose of a coming

time, describes it by saying, "The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" (^{<2312>}Isaiah 13:12). When the kingdom was divided under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, the history of Judah as a tribe lapsed into that of *Judah as a kingdom*. *SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF*.

II. Geographical Data. — In the first distribution of lands, the tribe of Judah received the southernmost part of Palestine to the extent of fully one third of the whole country west of the Jordan, which was to be distributed among the nine and a half tribes for which provision was to be made (^{<651>}Joshua 15). This oversight was discovered and rectified at the time of the second distribution, which was founded on an actual survey of the country, when Simeon received an allotment out of the territory which had before been wholly assigned to Judah (^{<691>}Joshua 19:9). *SEE SIMEON*. That which remained was still very large, and more proportioned to the future greatness than the actual wants of the tribe. We now also know, through the researches of recent travelers, that the extent of good land belonging to this tribe, southward, was much greater than had usually been supposed, much of that which had been laid down in maps as mere desert being actually composed of excellent pasture land, and in part of arable soil, still exhibiting some traces of ancient cultivation. Dan defended the western border against the inroads of the Philistines with a brave and well trained band of soldiers, having established, as it seems, a permanent camp on the commanding height between Zorah and Eshtaol (^{<7135>}Judges 13:25; 16:31; 18:12; *SEE DAN*). Simeon bore the brunt of all attacks and forays made on the southern border by the tribes of the great "Wilderness of Wandering;" and when the Edomites attempted to penetrate Judah, Simeon could always check them by an attack upon their flank. When Judah became a kingdom, the original extent of territory assigned to the tribe was more than restored or compensated, for it must have embraced the domains of Simeon, and probably also of Dan, and we know that Benjamin was likewise included in it. *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF*.

The boundaries and contents of the territory allotted to Judah are narrated at great length, and with greater minuteness than the others, in ^{<652>}Joshua 15:20-63. This may be due either to the fact that the lists were reduced to their present form at a later period, when the monarchy resided with Judah, and when more care would naturally be bestowed on them than on those of any other tribe, or to the fact that the territory was more important and more thickly covered with towns and villages than any other part of

Palestine. The greater prominence given to the genealogies of Judah in ^{<BIB>}1 Chronicles 2:3, 4, no doubt arises from the former reason. The towns are also specifically named, not only under the general divisions, but even in detailed groups. (See below.) The north boundary — coincident with the south boundary of Benjamin — began at the embouchure of the Jordan, entered the hills apparently at, or about the present road from Jericho, ran westward to en-Shemesh — probably the present Ain-Haud, below Bethany — thence over the Mount of Olives to Enrogel, in the valley beneath Jerusalem; went along the ravine of Hinnom, under the precipices of the city, climbed the hill in a northwest direction to the water of Nephtoah (probably Lifta), and thence by Kirjath-jearim (probably Kuriet el-Enab), Bethshemesh (Ain-Shems), Timnath, and Ekron to Jabneel on the sea coast. On the east the Dead Sea, and on the west the Mediterranean, formed the boundaries. The southern line is hard to determine, since it is denoted by places many of which have not been identified. It left the Dead Sea at its extreme south end, and joined the Mediterranean at the wady el-Arish; but between these two points it passed through Maaleh Acrabbim, the Wilderness of Zin, Hezron, Adar, Karkaa, and Azmon; the Wilderness of Zin the extreme south of all (^{<BIB>}Joshua 15:1-12). The country thus defined was sixty-five miles long, and averaged about fifty in breadth. But while this large tract was nominally allotted to Judah, the portion of it available for actual settlement was comparatively small, not amounting to one third of the whole. From it must also be deducted a large section stretching entirely across from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea, being the part set off to the tribe of Simeon. The actual territory of Judaea therefore extended, on an average, only about twenty-five miles from north to south, by about forty from east to west. *SEE TRIBE*. The whole of the above extensive region was from a very early date divided into four main regions.

1. The South. — the undulating pasture country which intervened between the hills, the proper possession of the tribe, and the deserts which encompass the lower part of Palestine (^{<BIB>}Joshua 15:21). It is this which is once designated as the wilderness (*midbar*) of Judah (^{<BIB>}Judges 1:16). It contained twenty-nine cities, with their dependent villages (^{<BIB>}Joshua 15:20-32), which, with Ether and Ashan in the mountains, were ceded to Simeon (^{<BIB>}Joshua 19:1-9). Amongst these southern cities the most familiar name is Beersheba. These southern pasturelands were the favorite

camping grounds of the old patriarchs, as they still are of those nomad tribes that frequent the southern border of Palestine. *SEE SIMEON.*

2. The Lowland (15:33; A.V. "valley") — or, to give it its own proper and constant appellation, the Shephelah — the broad belt or strip lying between the central highlands — "the mountain" — and the Mediterranean Sea; the lower portion of that maritime plain which extends through the whole of the seaboard of Palestine, from Sidon in the north to Rhinocolura at the south. This tract was the garden and the granary of the tribe. In it, long before the conquest of the country by Israel, the Philistines had settled themselves, never to be completely dislodged (~~4633~~ Nehemiah 13:23, 24). There, planted at equal intervals along the level coast, were their five chief cities, each with its circle of smaller dependents, overlooking, from the natural undulations of the ground, the "standing corn," "shocks," "vineyards and olives," which excited the ingenuity of Samson, and are still noticeable to modern travelers. "They are all remarkable for the beauty and profusion of the gardens which surround them — the scarlet blossoms of the pomegranates, the enormous oranges which gild the green foliage of their famous groves" (Stanley, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 257). From the edge of the sandy tract, which fringes the immediate shore right up to the very wall of the hills of Judah, stretches the immense plain of cornfields. In those rich harvests lies the explanation of the constant contests between Israel and the Philistines (*Syr. and Pal.* p. 258). From them were gathered the enormous cargoes of wheat which were transmitted to Phoenicia by Solomon in exchange for the arts of Hiram, and which in the time of the Herods still "nourished" the country of Tyre and Sidon (~~4121~~ Acts 12:20). There were the olive trees, the sycamore trees, and the treasures of oil, the care of which was sufficient to task the energies of two of David's special officers (~~1278~~ 1 Chronicles 27:28). The nature of this locality would seem to be reflected in the names of many of its towns if interpreted as Hebrew words: Dilean cucumbers; Gederah, Gederoth, Gederothaim, sheep folds; Zoreah, wasps; Ex-gannim, spring of gardens, etc. But we have yet to learn how far these names are Hebrew, and whether at best they are but mere Hebrew accommodations of earlier originals, and therefore not to be depended on for their significations. The number of cities in this district, without counting the smaller villages connected with them, was forty-two. Of these, however, many which belonged to the Philistines can only have been allotted to the tribe, and, if taken possession of by Judah, were only held for a time. What were the exact boundaries of the Shephelah we do not

know. We are at present ignorant of the principles on which the ancient Jews drew their boundaries between one territory and another. One thing only is almost certain, that they were not determined by the natural features of the ground, or else we should not find cities enumerated as in the lowland plain whose modern representatives are found deep in the mountains. *SEE JARMUTH; SEE JIPHTAH*, etc. (The latest information regarding this district is contained in Tobler's *Dritte Wanderung*, 1859.)

3. The third region of the tribe — the *Mountain*, the "hill country of Judah" — though not the richest, was, if not the largest, yet the most important of the four. Beginning considerably below Hebron, it stretches northward to Jerusalem, eastward to the Dead Sea slopes, and westward to the Shefelah, and forms an elevated district or plateau, which, though thrown into considerable undulations; yet preserves a general level in both directions. It is the southern portion of that elevated hilly district of Palestine which stretches north until intersected by the plain of Esdraelon, and on which Hebron, Jerusalem, and Shechem are the chief spots. On every side the approaches to it were difficult, and the passes easily defended. The towns and villages, too, were generally perched on the tops of hills or on rocky slopes. The resources of the soil were great. The country was rich in corn, wine, oil, and fruits; and the daring shepherds were able to lead their flocks far out over the neighboring plains and through the mountains. The surface of this region, which is of limestone, is monotonous enough. Round swelling hills and hollows, of somewhat bolder proportions than those immediately north of Jerusalem, which, though in early times probably covered with forests, *SEE HARETH*, have now, where not cultivated, no growth larger than a brushwood of dwarf oak, arbutus, and other bushes. In many places there is a good soft turf, discoverable even in the autumn, and in spring the hills are covered with flowers. The number of towns enumerated (⁽⁶⁶⁵⁸⁾Joshua 15:48-60) as belonging to this district is thirty-eight, but, if we may judge from the ruins which meet the eye on every side, this must have been very far below the real number. Hardly a hill which is not crowned by some fragments of stone buildings more or less considerable, those which are still inhabited surrounded by groves of olive trees, and inclosure of stone walls protecting the vineyards. Streams there are none, but wells and springs are frequent — in the neighborhood of "Solomon's Pools" at Urtas most abundant ones.

4. The fourth district is the *Wilderness* (*Midbar*, which here and there only appears to be synonymous with *Arabah*), the sunken district immediately

adjoining the Dead Sea (^{<0656>}Joshua 15:6), averaging ten miles in breadth, a wild, barren, uninhabitable region, fit only to afford scanty pasturage for sheep and goats, and a secure home for leopards, bears, wild goats, and outlaws (^{<0973>}1 Samuel 17:34; ^{<4013>}Mark 1:13; ^{<0920>}1 Samuel 22. sq.).

Different sections of it were called by different names, as "Wilderness of Engedi" (^{<0940>}1 Samuel 24:1); "Wilderness of Judah" (^{<0016>}Judges 1:16) "Wilderness of Maon", (^{<0934>}1 Samuel 23:24; *SEE DESERT*. It was the training ground of the shepherd warriors of Israel, "where David and his mighty men" were braced and trained for those feats of daring courage which so highly distinguished them. *SEE BETHLEHEM*; *SEE DAVID*. It contained only six cities, which must have been either, like Engedi, on the edge of the cliffs overhanging the sea, or else on the higher slopes of the basin. The "city of Salt" may have been on the salt plains, between the sea and the cliffs which form the southern termination to the *Ghor*.

Nine of the cities of Judah were allotted to the priests (^{<0619>}Joshua 21:9-19). The Levites had no cities in the tribe, and the priests had none out of it.

Picture for Judah

The following is a tabulated view of these subdivisions of the tribe with the cities in each group, as laid down in ^{<0652>}Joshua 15:21-63:

I. "The South" (^{<0611>}bgNhx), or Simeonitish portion.

- 1.** Kabzeel.
- 2.** Eder.
- 3.** Jagur.
- 4.** Kinah.
- 5.** Dimonah.
- 6.** Adadah.
- 7.** Kedlesh (Kadesh-Barnea).
- 8.** Hazor.
- 9** and **10.** Ithnan-Ziph or Zephath, and Hormah (Hazor-addah).
- 11.** Telen.
- 12.** Shema or Sheba (Hazorshual).
- 13.** Moladah.
- 14.** Heshmon or Azmon.
- 15.** Beth-palet.

16. Beersheha.

17 and **18.** Bealoth or Balah (Ramath-Nekeb) and Bizjoth-jah-Baalah (Baalath-beer or Lehi).

19. Im.

20. Azem.

21. Eltolad.

22. Chesil or Bethul.

23. Ziklag.

24. Madmannah or Bethmarcaboth.

25. Sansannah or Hazor-su-sah.

26. Lebaoth or Beth-lebaoth

27. Shilhim or Shamba

28 and **29.** Ain-Rimmon or En-rimmon.

The villages

(**1.**) Hazor-hadattah and

(**2.**) Kerieth-hezron, or Hazor-amam, both belonged to Hazor proper;

(**3.**) Hazor-gaddah to Hazor-shual.

Also

[**1.**] Ether and

[**2.**] Ashan out of the "plain" subdivision.

II. "The Valley" (**hl p^hh**), or *Plain*.

A. First group-N.W. corner.

1. Eshtaol..

2. Zoreah.

3. Ashna.

4. Zanoah.

5. En-gannim.

6. Tappuah.

7. Enam.

8. Jarmuth.

9. Adullam

10. Socoh.

11. Azekah.

12. Sharaim.
13. Adithain.
14. Gederah and Gedero-thaim.

B. Second group-south of the above, in the west part of the tribe.

1. Zenan.
2. Hadashah.
3. Migdal-gad.
4. Dileam.
5. Mizpeh
6. Joktheel } no copulative
7. Lachish } between.]
8. Bozkath.
9. Eglon.
10. Cabbon,
11. Lahmam.
12. Kithlish.
13. Gederoth [no **w** copulative between.]
14. Beth-dagon
15. Naamah.
16. Makkedah.

C. Third group-E. of group *b* and S. of group *a*; in the middle of the tribe, E. of the road from Eleutheropolis to Jerusalem.

1. Libnah.
- (2.) Ether.
- (3.) Ashan.
4. Jiphtah.
5. Ashnah.
6. Nezib
7. Keilah.
8. Achzib.
9. Mareshah.

D. Fourth group-Philistine pentarchy, on the Mediterranean shore.

1. Ekron (really in Dan).

2. Ashdod.
3. Gaza.

etc. (Ashkelon, and Gath [the last=Mizpeh, really in the " valley"]).

III. "The Mountains" (rhh), or *Highland*.

A. First group — along the border of Simeon, in the middle.

1. Shamir.
2. Jattir.
3. Socoh.
4. Dannah.
5. Kirjath-sannah=Debir.
6. Anah.
7. Eshtemoh.
8. Anim.
9. Goshen.
10. Holon.
11. Giloh.

B. Second group-N. of group *a*, in the southern part of the tribe, around Hebron.

1. Arab.
2. Dumah.
3. Eshean..
4. Janum.
5. Beth-tappuah.
6. Aphekah.
7. Humtah.
8. Kirjath-arba=Hebron.
9. Zior.

C. Third group-E. of group *b*.

1. Maon } [no W copulative between.]
2. Carmel
3. Ziph.
4. Juttah.

5. Jezreel.
6. Jokdeam.
7. Zanoah } [no W.
8. Cain } copulative
9. Gibeah } between]
10. Timnah.

D. Fourth group-N. of groups *b* and *c*, to Jerusalem on the N. boundary.

1. Halhul } [no copulative W between.]
2. Beth-zur
3. Gedor.
4. Maarath.
5. Beth-anoth
6. Eltekon.

E. Fifth group-in the N. medial angle, between group *d* and the "Valley" district.

1. Kirjath-baal=Kirjath-iearim.
2. Rabbah (? merely a title of Jerusalem).

F. Group added in the Septuagint between *d* and *e* -situated N. of group *e*, up to Jerusalem — probably should be added to *e*.]

1. Tekoah.
2. Ephrathah=Bethlehem.
3. Phagor.
4. Etam.
5. Kulon [in Benjamin] [prob. spurious].
6. Tatam.
7. Sores (Thebez) [in Benjamin] [spurious].
8. Karem (? Beth-haccerem.)
9. Gallim [in Benjamin].
10. Bethel [Thether].
11. Menukah.

IV. "The Wilderness" (rBdMh), or *Desert*.

1. Beth-arabah [really in Benjamin.][no copulative W between.]

2. Middin Supplementary-Jebus. }
3. Secacah.
4. Nibshan.
5. Ir-ham-Melach.
6. En-gedi.

The following table comprises all the scriptural localities in Judah (except those in Jerusalem), with their probable or ascertained identifications.

Aceldama.	Field.	<i>SEE JERUSALEM.</i>
Achor.	Valley.	<i>Wady Dabr?</i>
Achzib.	Town.	<i>SEE CHEZIB.</i>
Adithaim.	do.	<i>[Moheisin]?</i>
Adoraim.	do.	<i>Dura.</i>
Adullam.	do.	<i>[El-Kheishum]?</i>
Adummim.	do.	<i>Kulat-ed-Dem.</i>
Anab.	do.	<i>Anab.</i>
Anim.	do.	<i>Ghuwein.</i>
Aphekah.	do.	<i>[Sibta]?</i>
Aphrah.	do.	<i>SEE BETH-LE-APHEAH.</i>
Arab.	do.	<i>[El-Hadb]?</i>
Ashdod.	do.	<i>Esdud.</i>
Ashkelon.	do.	<i>Askulan.</i>
Ashnah.	do.	<i>[Beit-Alam]?</i>
Ashnah (⁽¹¹⁵⁸⁾ Joshua 15:43).	do.	<i>[Deir Aban]?</i>
Azekah (⁽¹¹⁵⁸⁾ Joshua 15:33).	do.	<i>Ahbek</i>
Azotus.	do.	<i>SEE ASHDOD.</i>
Azzah.	do.	<i>SEE GAZA.</i>
Baalath or Baale.	do.	<i>SEE KIRJATH-JEARIM.</i>
Baalath.	Mount.	<i>[Tell Hermes]?</i>
Beer.	Town.	<i>[Deir Dubban]?</i>
Berachah.	Valley.	<i>Wady Berakut.</i>
Bethanath.	Town.	<i>Beit-Anun.</i>
Bethany.	do.	<i>El-Azariyeh.</i>
Beth-dagon.	do.	<i>[Beit-Jerja]?</i>
Bethel.	do.	<i>SEE BETHUL.</i>

Bether.	Mount.	<i>Bittir?</i>
Beth-ezel.	Town.	[<i>Beit-Daras</i>]?
Beth-gader.	do.	SEE GEDER.
Beth-haccерem.	do.	<i>Jebel Fureidis?</i>
Beth-le-Aphrah.	do.	[<i>Beit-Affa</i>]?
Beth-lehem.	do.	<i>Beit-Lahm.</i>
Bethphage.	Village.	[S. top of <i>Jebel-et Tur</i>]?
Beth-tappuah.	Town.	<i>Taffuh.</i>
Beth-zur.	do.	<i>Beit-Sur.</i>
Bezekiel	do.	[E. of <i>Nukhalin</i>]??
Bilhah.	do.	SEE BAALAH.
Bozkath.	do.	[<i>Tell Hessy</i>]?
Cabbon.	do.	[<i>El-Kufeir</i>]?
Cain.	do.	<i>Yukin.</i>
Carmel.	do.	<i>Kurmul.</i>
Chesalon.	do.	<i>Kisla.</i>
Chezib.	do.	[Ruins with wells on W. <i>Seir</i>]?
Dannah.	do.	[<i>Ed-Dhokeriyeh</i>]?
Debir (^{<6154>} Joshua 15:49).	do.	<i>Khurbet ed-Dilbeh?</i>
Debir (^{<6157>} Joshua 15:7).	do.	[N.E. of <i>Wady Dabor</i>]?
Dileon.	do.	SEE DIMONAH.
Dilean.	do.	<i>Tina?</i>
Dimonah.	do.	<i>Ed-Dheib?</i>
Dumah.	do.	<i>Daumeh.</i>
Eben-Bohan.	Stone.	[N. side of W. <i>Dahr</i>]?
Enar.	Tower.	[S. of <i>Bethlehem</i>]?
Eglou.	Town.	<i>Ajlan.</i>
Elah.	Valley.	<i>Wady es-Sumt.</i>
Eltekon.	Town.	[<i>Beit-Sahur</i>]?
Enam.	do.	[<i>Deir el-Butm</i>]?
Eu-gannim.	do.	[<i>Rana</i>]?
En-gedi.	do.	<i>Ain-Jidy.</i>
Ephes-dammin.	Field.	SEE ELAH.
Ephrath or Ephrata.	Town.	SEE BETHLEHEM.
Eshcol.	Valley.	<i>Ain-Eskali.</i>
Eshean.	do.	<i>Khursa?</i>

Eshtemoa.	do.	<i>Semua.</i>
Etam.	do.	<i>Urtus?</i>
Gath.	do.	<i>Tell es-Safieh</i>
Gaza.	do.	<i>Ghuzzeh.</i>
Geder.	Town.	SEE GEDOR.
Gederah.	do.	<i>Gheterah.</i>
Gederoth.	do.	<i>[Beit-Tima]?</i>
Gederothaim.	do.	SEE GEDERAH.
Gedor.	do.	<i>Jedur.</i>
Gibeah.	do.	<i>[Erfaiyeh]?</i>
Gilon.	do.	<i>[Rafat]?</i>
Goshen.	do.	<i>[Deir Shems]?</i>
Goshen.	District.	<i>[S. of Kirjath-jearim]?</i>
Hachilah.	Hill.	<i>[Tell Ziph].</i>
Hadashah.	Town.	<i>El-Jorah?</i>
Halhul.	do.	<i>Halhul.</i>
Hareth.	Forest.	SEE ARUBOTH.
Hazon-tamar.	Town.	SEE ENGEDI.
Hebron.	do.	<i>El-Khulil.</i>
Hepher.	do.	<i>[Um-Burj]?</i>
Holon.	do.	<i>[Beit-Amra]?</i>
Humtah.	do.	<i>[Sabzin el-Almeh]?</i>
Ir-nahash.	do.	<i>Deir Nekhaz.</i>
Jabez.	do.	SEE KIRJATH-JEARIM.
Janum.	do.	<i>[Ras Jabreh]?</i>
Jarmuth.	do.	<i>Yarmuk.</i>
Jattir.	do.	<i>Attir.</i>
Jebus.	do.	S. part of JERUSALEM.
Jehovah-jireh.	Altar.	SEE MORIAH.
Jeruel.	Desert.	<i>[S.E. of Minea]?</i>
Jerusalem.	City.	<i>El-Khuds.</i>
Jeshimon.	Desert.	SEE JUDAH (Desert of).
Jeshua.	Town.	<i>Yeshua.</i>
Jezeel.	do.	<i>[Zurtul]?</i>
Jiptah.	do.	<i>[Jimrin]?</i>
Jokdeam.	do.	<i>[Ed-Dar]?</i>
Joktheel.	do.	<i>[Balén]?</i>

Jordan.	River.	<i>Sheriat el-Kebir</i>
	Plain.	<i>El-Ghor</i>
	Mts.	Middle Ridge
Judaea.	Desert.	E. plain
	Valley.	Sea shore
Juttah.	Town.	<i>Yutta</i>
Keilah	do.	<i>Kila</i>
Kerioth.	do.	<i>Kureitein.</i>
Kirjath-jearim.	do.	<i>Kuryat el-Enab?</i>
Kirjath-arba or Kirjath-Baal.	do.	SEE HEBRON
Kirjath-sannah or Kirjath-sepher.	do	SEE DEBIR
Kithlish.	do.	[<i>Jelameh</i>]?
Lachish	do.	<i>Um-Lakhis.</i>
Lahmam.	do.	[<i>Beit-Lehia</i>]?
Libnah.	do.	<i>Arak el-Menshiyeh?</i>
Maarath.	do.	[<i>Mersian</i>]?
Macpelah.	Cave.	SEE HEBRON.
Makkedah.	Town.	<i>Sumeil?</i>
Mamre.	Field.	SEE HEBRON
Maon.	Town.	<i>Tell Main.</i>
Mareshah.	do.	<i>Tell Merahs.</i>
Mekonah.	do.	[<i>Jerash</i>]?
Middin.	do.	[<i>Khan Mardeh</i>]?
Migdal-gad.	Town.	<i>El-Mejel</i>
Mizpeh.	do.	SEE GATH.
Moresbeth-gath	do.	<i>Mar Hanneh?</i>
Naamah.	do.	[<i>Neamah</i>]?
Nephtoah.	Spring.	<i>Ain Yalo?</i>
Netophah.	Town.	<i>Antubah?</i>
Nezib.	do.	<i>Beit Nusib.</i>
Nibshan.	do.	[<i>Kasr el-Leiman</i>]?
Rabbah.	do.	SEE JERUSALEM.
Rachel's Tomb.	Sepulchr	N. of Bethlehem
Ramah or Ramathaim-zophim.	Town.	<i>Rameh?</i>

Salt City.	do.	[<i>Khulat um-Baghek</i>]?
Saphir.	do.	<i>Es-Sawafir</i> ?
Secacah.	do.	[<i>Kasr Antar</i>]?
Sela-hammalekoth.	Rock.	SEE MAON.
Shaaraim or Sharaim.	Town	[<i>Shahmeh</i>]?
Shamir.	do.	[<i>Simia</i>]?
Shocho (¹⁰⁵⁸ Joshua 15:48)	do	<i>Shuweikeh.</i>
Siddim.	Vale.	S. end of Dead Sea?
Sirah.	Well.	[<i>Sasirah</i>]?
Socoh or Shocoh.	Town.	<i>Shuweikeh.</i>
Sorek.	Valley.	<i>Wady Simsin</i> ?
Tappuah.	Town.	[<i>Beit Atab</i>]?
Tekoah.	do.	<i>Tekua.</i>
Timnah.	Town.	[<i>Um el-Amad</i>]?
Zaanah.	do.	SEE ZENAN.
Zauoali (in the plain).	do.	<i>Zannah.</i>
Zanoah (in the hills).	do.	<i>Zanutah</i> ?
Zeiuah.	do.	[<i>Jenin</i>]?
Zephathah.	Valley.	Wady S. of Maresh?
Ziklag.	Town.	[<i>Musrefa</i>]?
Zior.	do.	<i>Sair</i> ?
Ziph.	do.	<i>Zif.</i>
Ziz.	Cliff.	Precipice W. of Ain Jidy?
Zuph.	District.	SEE RAMATHAIM ZOPHIM.

Judah, Kingdom Of.

When the territory of all the rest of Israel, except Judah and Benjamin, was lost to the kingdom of Rehoboam, a special single name was needed to denote that which remained to him; and almost of necessity the word *Judah* received an extended meaning, according to which it comprised not Benjamin only, but the priests and Levites, who were ejected in great numbers from Israel, and rallied round the house of David. At a still later time, when the nationality of the ten tribes had been dissolved, and every practical distinction between the ten and the two had vanished during the captivity, the scattered body had no visible head, except in Jerusalem,

which had been reoccupied mostly by a portion of *Judah's* exiles. *SEE CAPTIVITY*. In consequence, the name Judah (or *Jew*) attached itself to the entire nation from about the epoch of the restoration *SEE JEW*. But in this article Judah is understood of the people over which David's successors reigned, from Rehoboam to Zedekiah. It substantially corresponded to the *Judaea* (q.v.) of later times.

I. *Extent of the Kingdom.* — When the disruption of Solomon's kingdom took place at Shechem, only the tribe of Judah followed the house of David. But almost immediately afterwards, when Rehoboam conceived the design of establishing his authority over Israel by force of arms, the tribe of Benjamin also is recorded as obeying his summons, and contributing its warriors to make up his army. Jerusalem, situate within the borders of Benjamin (^{<688>}Joshua 18:28, etc.), yet won from the heathen by a prince of Judah, connected the frontiers of the two tribes by an indissoluble political bond. By the erection of the city of David, Benjamin's former adherence to Israel (^{<109>}2 Samuel 2:9) was cancelled, though at least two Benjamite towns, Bethel and Jericho, were included in the northern kingdom. A part, if not all, of the territory of Simeon (^{<926>}1 Samuel 27:6; ^{<1193>}1 Kings 19:3; comp. ^{<690>}Joshua 19:1) and of Dan (^{<4110>}2 Chronicles 11:10; comp. ^{<694>}Joshua 19:41, 42) was recognized as belonging to Judah, and in the reigns of Abijah and Asa the southern kingdom was enlarged by some additions taken out of the territory of Ephraim (^{<439>}2 Chronicles 13:19; 15:8; 17:2). After the conquest and deportation of Israel by Assyria, the influence, and perhaps the delegated jurisdiction of the king of Judah, sometimes extended over the territory which formerly belonged to Israel. *SEE JUDAEA*.

II. *Population.* — A singular gauge of the growth of the kingdom of Judah is supplied by the progressive augmentation of the army under successive kings. In David's time (^{<1049>}2 Samuel 24:9, and ^{<326>}1 Chronicles 21:5) the warriors of Judah numbered at least 500,000. But Rehoboam brought into the field (^{<1121>}1 Kings 12:21) only 180,000 men; Abijah, eighteen years afterwards, 400,000 (^{<438>}2 Chronicles 13:3); Asa (^{<448>}2 Chronicles 14:8), his successor, 580,000, exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his two predecessors; Jehoshaphat (^{<474>}2 Chronicles 17:14-19), the next king, numbered his warriors in five armies, the aggregate of which is 1,160,000, exactly double the army of his father, and exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his three predecessors. After four inglorious reigns,

the energetic Amaziah could muster only 300,000 men when he set out to recover Edom. His son Uzziah had a standing (^{<4431>}2 Chronicles 26:11) force of 307,500 fighting men. It would be out of place here to discuss the question which has been raised as to the accuracy of these numbers. *SEE NUMBER* So far as they are authentic, it may be safely reckoned that the population subject to each king was about four times the number of the fighting men in his dominions. *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.*

III. Resources. — Unless Judah had some other means of acquiring wealth besides pasture and tillage — as by maritime commerce from the Red Sea ports, or (less probably) from Joppa, or by keeping up the old trade (^{<1103>}1 Kings 10:28) with Egypt — it seems difficult to account for that ability to accumulate wealth which supplied the Temple treasury with sufficient store to invite so frequently the hand of the spoiler. Egypt, Damascus, Samaria, Nineveh, and Babylon had each in succession a share of the pillage. The treasury was emptied by Shishak (^{<1146>}1 Kings 14:26), again by Asa (^{<1153>}1 Kings 15:18), by Jehoash of Judah (^{<1218>}2 Kings 12:18), by Jehoash of Israel (^{<1244>}2 Kings 14:14), by Ahaz (^{<1268>}2 Kings 16:8), by Hezekiah (^{<1285>}2 Kings 18:15), and by Nebuchadnezzar (^{<1213>}2 Kings 24:13).

IV. Advantages of Position. — In Edom a vassal king probably retained his fidelity to the son of Solomon, and guarded for Jewish enterprise the road to the maritime trade with Ophir. Philistia maintained, for the most part, a quiet independence. Syria, in the height of her brief power, pushed her conquests along the northern and eastern frontiers of Judah, and threatened Jerusalem; but the interposition of the territory of Israel generally relieved Judah from any immediate contact with that dangerous neighbor. The southern border of Judah, resting on the uninhabited desert, was not agitated by any turbulent stream of commercial activity like that which flowed by the rear of Israel, from Damascus to Tyre. Though some of the Egyptian kings were ambitious, that ancient kingdom was far less aggressive as a neighbor to Judah than Assyria was to Israel.

The kingdom of Judah thus possessed many advantages which secured for it a longer continuance than that of Israel. A frontier less exposed to powerful enemies, a soil less fertile, a population hardier and more united, a fixed and venerated center of administration and religion, a hereditary aristocracy in the sacerdotal caste, an army always subordinate, a succession of kings which no revolution interrupted, many of whom were wise and good, and strove successfully to promote the moral and spiritual

as well as the material prosperity of their people; still more than these, the devotion of the people to the One True God, which, if not always a pure and elevated sentiment, was yet a contrast to such devotion as could be inspired by the worship of the calves or of Baal; and, lastly, the popular reverence for arid obedience to the divine law so far as they learned it from their teachers — to these and other secondary causes is to be attributed the fact that Judah survived her more populous and more powerful sister kingdom by 135 years, and lasted from B.C. 975 to B.C. 586. (See Bernhardy, *De causis quibus effectum sit quod regnum Judoe diutius persisteret quam regn. Israel*, in the *Annal. Acad. Groning.* 1822-23, p. 124 sq.; also Lovan. 1824; Schmeidler, *Der Untergang d. Reichs Juda*, Bresl. 1831.)

V. History. — For the circumstances that led to the schism, and for a comparison with the history of the rival kingdom, *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF*. For a further examination of the many chronological difficulties arising from the double list of kings, *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. The annals of the kingdom will be found detailed under the name of the several kings, and a general view under the articles *JERUSALEM SEE JERUSALEM*, and *PALESTINE SEE PALESTINE*. (See White, *Kings of Judah and Israel*, Lond. 1863; Hesse, *Biographies of Kings of Judah*, Lond. 1865; Hess, *Geschichte der Könige Juda und Israel*, Zurich, 1787; also *Gesch. der Regenten Juda nach dem Exil*, ib. 1788.) It will be sufficient, as a *resume*, here to notice the fact that the kingdom of Judah, in the course of its history, acted upon three different lines of policy in succession.

1. Animosity against the rival Kingdom of Israel. — The first three kings of Judah seem to have cherished the hope of reestablishing their authority over the Ten Tribes; for sixty years there was war between them and the kings of Israel. Neither the disbanding of Rehoboam's forces by the authority of Shemaiah, nor the pillage of Jerusalem by the irresistible Shishak, served to put an end to the fraternal hostility. The victory achieved by the daring Abijah brought to Judah a temporary accession of territory. Asa appears to have enlarged it still further, and to have given so powerful a stimulus to the migration of religious Israelites to Jerusalem that Baasha was induced to fortify Ramah with a view to checking the movement. Asa provided for the safety of his subjects from invaders by building, like Rehoboam, several fenced cities; he repelled an alarming irruption of an Ethiopian horde, he hired the armed intervention of

Benhadad I, king of Damascus, against Baasha; and he discouraged idolatry and enforced the worship of the true God by severe penal laws. (See Junge, *Bella inter Judsam et Israel*. Tub. 1716.)

2. Resistance (generally in Alliance with Israel) to Damascus. — Hanani's remonstrance (¹⁴⁶⁷2 Chronicles 16:7) prepares us for the reversal by Jehoshaphat of the policy which Asa pursued towards Israel and Damascus. A close alliance sprang up with strange rapidity between Judah and Israel. For eighty-years, till the time of Amaziah, there was no open war between them, and Damascus appears as their chief and common enemy, though it rose afterwards from its overthrow to become, under Rezin, the ally of Pekal against Ahaz. Jehoshaphat, active and prosperous, repelled nomad invaders from the desert, curbed the aggressive spirit of his nearer neighbors, and made his influence felt even among the Philistines and Arabians. A still more lasting benefit was conferred on his kingdom by his persevering efforts for the religious instruction of the people and the regular administration of justice. The reign of Jehoram, the husband of Athaliah, a time of bloodshed, idolatry, and disaster, was cut short by disease. Ahaziah was slain by Jehu. Athaliah, the granddaughter of a Tyrian king, usurped the blood stained throne of David, till the followers of the ancient religion put her to death, and crowned Jehoash the surviving scion of the royal house. His preserver, the high priest, acquired prominent personal influence for a time; but the king fell into idolatry, and failing to withstand the power of Syria, was murdered by his own officers. The vigorous Amaziah, flushed with the victory of Edom, provoked a war with his more powerful contemporary Jehoash, the conqueror of the Syrians, and Jerusalem was entered and plundered by the Israelites. But their energies were sufficiently occupied in the task of completing the subjugation of Damascus. Under Uzziah and Jotham, Judah long enjoyed political and religious prosperity till the wanton Ahaz, surrounded by united enemies, with whom he was unable to cope, became in an evil hour the tributary and vassal of Tiglath-Pileser.

3. Deference, perhaps Vassalage, to the Assyrian King. — Already in the fatal grasp of Assyria, Judah was yet spared for a checkered existence of almost another century and a half after the termination of the kingdom of Israel. The effect of the repulse of Sennacherib, of the signal religious revivals under Hezekiah and Josiah, and of the extension of these kings' salutary influence over the long severed territory of Israel, was apparently done away by the ignominious reign of the impious Manasseh, and the

lingering decay of the whole people under the four feeble descendants of Josiah. Provoked by their treachery and imbecility, their Babylonian master, who had meanwhile succeeded to the dominion of the Assyrians, drained, in successive deportations, all the strength of the kingdom. The consummation of the ruin came upon them in the destruction of the Temple by the hand of Nebuzaradan, amid the wailing of prophets and the taunts of heathen tribes released at length from the yoke of David.

VI. Moral State. — The national life of the Hebrews appeared to become gradually weaker during these successive stages of history, until at length it seemed extinct; but there was still, as there had been all along, a spiritual life hidden within the body. It was a time of hopeless darkness to all but those Jews who had strong faith in God, with a clear and steady insight into the ways of Providence as interpreted by prophecy. The time of the division of the kingdoms was the golden age of prophecy. In each kingdom the prophetic office was subject to peculiar modifications which were required in Judah by the circumstances of the priesthood, in Israel by the existence of the house of Baal and the altar in Bethel. If, under the shadow of the Temple, there was a depth and a grasp elsewhere unequalled, in the views of Isaiah and the prophets of Judah; if their writings touched and elevated the hearts of thinking men in studious retirement in the silent night watches, there was also, in the few burning words and energetic deeds of the prophets of Israel, a power to tame a lawless multitude and to check the high handed tyranny and idolatry of kings. The organization and moral influence of the priesthood were matured in the time of David; from about that time to the building of the second Temple the influence of the prophets rose and became predominant. Some historians have suspected that after the reign of Athaliah, the priesthood gradually acquired and retained excessive and unconstitutional power in Judah. The recorded facts scarcely sustain the conjecture. Had it been so, the effect of such power would have been manifest in the exorbitant wealth and luxury of the priests, and in the constant and cruel enforcement of penal laws, like those of Asa, against irreligion. But the peculiar offenses of the priesthood, as witnessed in the prophetic writings, were of another kind. Ignorance of God's word, neglect of the instruction of the laity, untruthfulness, and partial judgments, are the offenses specially imputed to them, just such as might be looked for where the priesthood is a hereditary caste and irresponsible, but neither ambitious nor powerful. When the priest either, as was the case in Israel, abandoned the land, or, as in Judah, ceased to be really a teacher, ceased from spiritual

communion with God, ceased from living sympathy with man, and became the mere image of an intercessor, a mechanical performer of ceremonial duties little understood or heeded by himself, then the prophet was raised up to supply some of his deficiencies, and to exercise his functions so far as was necessary. While the priests sink into obscurity and almost disappear, except from the genealogical tables, the prophets come forward appealing everywhere to the conscience of individuals — in Israel as wonder workers, calling together God's chosen few out of an idolatrous nation, and in Judah as teachers and seers, supporting and purifying all that remained of ancient piety, explaining each mysterious dispensation of God as it was unfolded, and promulgating his gracious spiritual promises in all their extent. The part which Isaiah, Jeremiah, and other prophets took in preparing the Jews for their captivity, cannot, indeed, be fully appreciated without reviewing the succeeding efforts of Ezekiel and Daniel. But the influence which they exercised on the national mind was too important to be overlooked in a sketch, however brief, of the history of the kingdom of Judah. *SEE PROPHET.*

Judah, Mountains Of.

This is appropriately the name of a range of hills to the south and west of Jerusalem, styled in ^{<413>}Luke 1:39, 65, the "hill country of Judaea" (ἡ ὄρεινὴ τῆς Ἰουδαίας). The hills are low and conical, uniform in shape even to weariness; the vegetation, save in early spring, is dry and parched, the valleys are broad and featureless. Everywhere at the present day are signs that the land of corn, and wine, and oil has become desolate. The fenced cities and villages surmount the hills, but they are in ruins; the terraces where once were vineyards and cornfields can be traced along the mountain sides, but they are neglected; wells and pools of water are to be found in every valley, but there is none to drink of them. *SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.*

Judah, Wilderness Of.

The desert of Judah (ἡ ἔρημος τῆς Ἰουδαίας) is mentioned in the title of ^{<650>}Psalm 63, and the desert of Judaea (αἱ ἔρημοι, or ἡ ἔρημος τῆς Ἰουδαίας), frequently referred to in the gospels, is considered to be the same locality. It was situated adjacent to the Dead Sea and the River Jordan, and was a mountainous and thinly inhabited tract of country, but abounding in pastures. In the time of Joshua it had six cities, with their villages

(^{<6159>}Joshua 15:61, 62), but it is now, and has long been, one of the most dreary and desolate regions of the whole country (Robinson's *Researches*, 2, 202, 310). The positions of this desert specially alluded to in the N.T. are,

- (1.) That in which John the Baptist grew up, probably west of the Dead Sea (^{<6160>}Luke 1:80; 3:2);
- (2.) That where he baptized, i.e. the uninhabited tract along the Jordan (^{<6161>}Matthew 3:1; ^{<6162>}Mark 1:4; compare 5);
- (3.) That where Jesus was tempted, perhaps the high desert west of Jericho (^{<6163>}Matthew 4:1; ^{<6164>}Mark 1:12, 13);
- (4.) The tract between the Mount of Olives and Jericho, probably referred to in ^{<6165>}Acts 21:38 (see Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 8, 6);
- (5.) The tract adjacent to the city Ephraim, probably Tayibeh, towards the Jordan (^{<6166>}John 11:54). *SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.*

Judah Upon Jordan

(^{<6167>}Deŷhihd? Why] *Judah of the Jordan*; Sept. and Vulg. in most editions omit "Judah" altogether), is mentioned as the extreme eastern limit of the territory of Naphtali (but not within it), apparently on its northern boundary (^{<6168>}Joshua 19:34), and therefore probably referring to a tract immediately east of that around the sources of the Jordan, between Mount Hermon and Baniass. Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 185) plausibly explains the application of the name of Judah to a region so far distant from the territory of that tribe by assigning it as the title to the Gileaditish district embraced in the circuit of the towns of *Havoth-Jair*, i.e. the villages of Jair, who was a descendant of Judah (^{<6169>}1 Chronicles 2:21); and he adduces Talmudical authorities for reckoning his possessions as a part of that tribe. *SEE JAIR.* The same explanation had been suggested by C. von Raumer (cited by Keil, *Comment. on Josh.* ad loc.). Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, 1, 389 sq.) speaks of three interesting domes in this vicinity, called those of *Seid Yehuda* (i.e. "Lord Judah," the Arabs traditionally holding that they represent the tomb of the son of Jacob), which he believes is a clue to the connection of this city with the tribe of the same name.

Picture for Judah

2. One of the Levites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (^{<16128>}Nehemiah 12:8). B.C. 536. It is perhaps he whose sons are alluded to (but unnamed) as aiding the priests in pushing the reconstruction of the Temple (^{<15110>}Ezra 3:9); unless this latter be rather the person elsewhere called HODAVIAH (^{<15110>}Ezra 2:40).
3. One of those who followed the half of the Jewish chiefs around the southern section of the newly erected walls of Jerusalem, but whether he was a Levite or priest is not stated (^{<161234>}Nehemiah 12:34). B.C. 446.
4. One of those who accompanied with musical performances the procession around the southern quarter of the walls of Jerusalem lately reconstructed (^{<161236>}Nehemiah 12:36). B.C. 446. He was perhaps identical with the preceding..
5. Son of Senuah, a descendant of Benjamin, and prefect of Acra or the Lower City (^{<16119>}חנניא [האי] over the second city, not "second over the city," as the Auth. Vers. following the Sept. and Vulg.) after the exile (^{<16119>}Nehemiah 11:9). B.C. cir. 440.

Judah Hak-Kodesh

or *the Holy*, son of Simon, of the tribe of Benjamin, and a descendant of Hillel I, is one of the most celebrated characters in Jewish history. He was born at Tiberias, according to accounts, about 135, on the same day on which Rabbi Akiba suffered martyrdom — an event predicted, according to his admirers, in the verse of Solomon: "One sun ariseth, and one sun goeth down." While yet a youth he was, on account of his extraordinary proficiency in Jewish law, admitted to the Sanhedrim, and on the death of his father followed him in the presidency of that learned body. The manner in which he administered the duties of this high office was in itself sufficient to win for him "the praise of his people in all their generations." Maimonides describes him as having been a man so nobly gifted by the Almighty with the choicest endowments as to be the phoenix and ornament of his age. But the best evidence of the high estimation in which his contemporaries held him is afforded by the many favorable epithets which they fastened on him. Besides the title of *Nasi*, which his position as president of the Sanhedrim secured him, he was more generally known as "Rabbi," which was applied to him *κατ' ἐξοχήν*,^s with no further note of

individual distinction. He was known as the "saint," the "holy one," the meek. Being, like Hillel I, of the house of David, he sometimes was, as Bar-Cocheba had previously been, looked upon as the promised Messiah. But this opinion was, after all, confined only to a few. Certain it is, however, that he exerted an influence over the Jewish nation of his day far wider and more powerful in its extent than had ever fallen to the lot of any Nasi, even any member of his house since the days of Hillel. This may be due perhaps not so much to his vast erudition as to his wealth, which enabled him to become the supporter of hundreds and thousands of poor youths, who after they had sat at his feet, went out all over the Jewish abodes to sound aloud the praises of their noble master and teacher in Israel. But Judah hak-Kodesh has far greater claims for our consideration: he has built himself a far more enduring monument as the Moses of later Rabbinism (q.v.), as the compiler of the Mishna (q.v.), or code of traditional law, the embodiment of all the authorized interpretations of the Mosaic law, the traditions, the decisions of the learned. and the precedents of the courts or schools — a sort of *Jewish Pandects*. "In attempting this Herculean task," says Etheridge (*Introd. Jewish Lit.* p. 88), "he may have been moved by the peculiar condition of the Jewish community. They were a scattered people, liable at any hour to the renewal of a wasting persecution, and maintaining their religious standing in the presence of an ever advancing Christianity, and in defiance of the menaces of a world which always viewed them with hatred. Their schools, tolerated today, might tomorrow be under the imperial interdict, and the lips of the Rabbins, which now kept the knowledge of the law, become dumb by the terror of the oppressor. These circumstances possessed him with the apprehension that the traditional learning received from their fathers would, without a fixed memorial, at no distant time be either greatly corrupted or altogether perish from among them. It was his wish also to furnish the Hebrew people with such a documentary code as would be a sufficient guide for them, not only in the affairs of religion, but also in their dealings with one another in civil life, so as to render it unnecessary for them to have recourse to suits at law at the heathen tribunals. In addition to these motives, he was probably actuated also by the prevailing spirit of codification, which was one of the characteristics of the age. Legal science was in the ascendant, and the great law schools of Rome, Berytus, and Alexandria were in their meridian; and Judah, who loved his law better than they could theirs, wished to give it the same advantages of simplification, system, and immutability which such jurists as Salvius Julianus had

accomplished for the Roman laws in the time of Hadrian, and Ulpian was laboring at in his own day." The Mishna is divided into six parts (*sedarim*): the first treats of agriculture, the second of festivals, the third of marriages, the fourth of civil affairs, the fifth of sacrifices and religious ceremonies, and the sixth of legal purification. The text was published with short glosses at Amsterdam (1631, 8vo), and often reprinted, with more or less extensive commentaries, at Amsterdam, Venice, Constantinople, etc. (See a list of the editions, translations, etc., in First, *Biblioth. Judaica*.) His last days Judah hak-Kodesh spent at Sepphoris, whither he removed on account of his failing health. The exact date of his death is not known, but it must have occurred between 190 and 194. He is frequently spoken of as a friend and contemporary of one of the emperors Antoninus, generally supposed to be Marcus Aurelius, but Grätz and other critics are inclined to doubt the possibility of an intimate relation between this head of the Jewish Church and a Roman emperor. See, however, Bodeck, *M. A. Antoninus als Freund u. Zeitgenosse des R. Jehuda ha-Nasi* (Lpz. 1868); *Contemp. Rev.* 1869, p. 81 sq. Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, 4, 246 sq. See also Schneeberger, *Life and Works of Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi* (Berl. 1870); Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 2, 425 sq. (J.H.W.)

Judah Judghan, The Persian

one of the most celebrated of the Karaites, afterwards himself the founder of an independent Jewish sect, flourished probably about the first half of the 9th century, in the city Hamadan, in Persia. His opponents say of him that he was of low descent, and that his early years were spent as a tender of camels, but the learning he displayed and his intimate knowledge of Mohammedanism make this report doubtful. We know nothing definitely of him until he appeared before his countrymen with the declaration that he was the forerunner of the Messiah, and preached the doctrine of free will, and non intervention of God in mundane affairs. He also argued that Sabbaths and festivals were no longer to be kept, as they had been done away with by the dispersion of the chosen people, enjoining, however, at the same time, a life of strict asceticism. Preaching, as he did, under the very shadow of Mohammedanism, doctrines very much akin to it. **SEE MUTAZILITES**, he found ready converts, and his followers increased rapidly. They continued faithful even after his decease, believing (like the Shiites of Ali) that he did not die a natural death and that he was to reappear and give to Judaism a new law. The *Mushkhanites* (q.v.) may be considered as a branch of this sect. For further details, see Fürst,

Geschichte d. Karäerthums, p. 26 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 5, 227 sq., 516 sq. (J.H.W.)

Judah (Or Juda), Leo,

one of the Swiss reformers, was born at Germar, in Alsace, in 1482. His father's name was John Jud, but whether of Jewish descent, Leo himself tells us he was unable to say. The name, however, exposed him to reproach, and perhaps for this reason we find him sometimes designating himself as *Leo Keller*; in Zürich he was known as *Meister Löw*, and this name his descendants adopted. He was educated for the medical profession, but through the influence of Zwingle forsook this for the clerical. He succeeded the latter in the church of Notre Dame des Eremites, and finally became his associate at Zurich. Together they entered zealously on their work of reform, and Judah contributed no little to the spreading and propagating of Zwinglian ideas. With the great reformer he appeared at the second conference in Zurich (1523), and together they replied to all who defended the worship of images and the celebration of the mass as a sacrifice. Judah died June 19, 1542. He made a translation of the greater part of the Old Testament from the Hebrew text, and also of the New from the Greek. It was completed by Bibliander and Peter Cholin, and reviewed by Pellicanus (Zurich, 1543; reprinted at Paris, with the Vulgate, in 1545). **SEE GERMAN VERSIONS.** Of his original productions, his *Catechism* (1534, Latin and German) is the most noted. He translated the writings of Zwingle and Luther. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6, 365; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.

Judaism

the name by which we designate the religious doctrines and rites of the people chosen by Jehovah as his peculiar people; the descendants of Jacob, to whom the law was given by Moses, and religious light and truth were revealed in the Old Testament; the most important branch of that family of nations conventionally comprised under the title of Shemites — a people of many fates and of many names, called by the Bible the people of God; by Mohammed, the people of the Book; by Hegel, "the people of the *Geist*," and now generally known as *Hebrews*, *Israelites*, or *Jews*.

Abrahamism. — To the Christian student especially, the early development of the doctrines of this people is interesting, as unfolded in the pages of the older half of the inspired writings that go to make up the basis of his own creed. Judaism is preeminently a monotheistic faith, originating with the

patriarch Abraham when, in an era of polytheism and flagrant vice, he became the founder of monotheism by a prompt recognition and worship of the one living and *true* God; and from that remote day to this, all the Jewish people pride themselves in being "children of Abraham." It is a fact striking to every student of comparative religion, and in no small degree a proof of the authenticity of the O.T. Scriptures, that this monotheistic faith originated at a time when the religion of all other branches of the, Isame family, which with the Hebrew, make up the Shemitic, differed widely from it in every respect. The Assyrians, Babylonians, Phoenicians, and Carthaginians all possessed a nearly identical religion, but one that lacked the essential feature of Judaism. They all, it is true, believed in a supreme god, called by the different names of Ilu, Bel, Set, Hadad, Moloch, Chemosh, Jaoh, El, Adon, Asshur, but they also all believed in subordinate and secondary beings, emanations from this supreme being, his manifestations to the world, rulers of the planets; and, like other pantheistic religions, the custom prevailed among these Shemitic nations of promoting first one and then another deity to be the supreme object of worship. Among the Assyrians, as among the Egyptians, the gods were often arranged in triads, as that of Anu, Bel, and Ao. Anu or Oannes wore the head of a fish; Bel wore the horns of a bull; Ao was represented by a serpent. These religions, in short, represented the gods as that Spirit within and behind natural objects and forces powers within the world, rather than, as among the Hebrews, a Spirit above the world. The Hebrews' God was a God above nature, not simply in it. He stood alone; unaccompanied by secondary deities. His worship required purity, not pollution; its aim was holiness, and its spirit humane, not cruel. Monotheistic from the first, it became an absolute monotheism in its development. In all the Shemitic nations, behind the numerous divine beings representing the powers of nature there was, it is true, dimly visible one supreme Being, of whom all these were emanations; but there was also among all of them, except the Hebrew branch, a tendency to lose sight of *the first great Cause*, the very reverse of the tendency of the faith of Abraham, whose soul rose to the contemplation of the perfect Being, above all and the source of all. With passionate love he adored this most high God, maker of heaven and earth. Such was his devotion to this almighty Being, that men said, "Abraham is the friend of the most high God." The difference, then, between the religion of Abraham and that of the polytheistic nations was, that while they descended from the idea of a supreme Being into that of subordinate ones,

he went back to that of the supreme, and clung to this with his whole soul (Clark, *Ten great Religions*, chap. 10). *SEE ABRAHAM*.

Mosaism. — This abstract faith continued to be the faith of the Israelites until it was transformed at Mount Sinai by the Lord himself, through his chosen servant Moses. Thereafter the Abrahamic idea was clothed in forms rendered necessary not only by the character of the age, but also by the frailty of men, to the generality of whom hitherto ceremonies had been absolutely essential. From the "Mosaic Revelation," as Dean Stanley (*Jewish Ch.*, First Series, Lect. 7) calls it, dates the establishment not only of the Judaic principle itself, but of the *Theocracy* (see Josephus, *Apion*, 2, 17). Thenceforth the followers of Abraham not only worshipped the one "supreme Being," but they were governed by him; i.e. from the converse of Moses with the Lord dates the ultimate union of the Jewish Church and State — the correlation of life and religion, of the nation and the individual. *SEE MOSES; SEE LAW*.

Prophetism. — Surrounded by idolaters on all sides, with whom they were brought in contact continually, the Hebrews gradually disobeyed the commandments of Sinai until idolatry destroyed all personal morality, and the chosen people knew not their Lord. To save the race from utter apostasy, holy men were inspired by the Lord to make known the penalty of idolatry and immorality. Amid the trials and sore afflictions with which he visits the nation, he yet declares the perpetuity of the Jewish faith. A Messiah shall eventually gather in the people, and to the Lord alone shall service be rendered. *SEE MESSIAH*. Though the present plant shall wither, the seed shall continue to live, from whose germination shall spring a flower of greater fragrance in the fullness of time. All through the captivity among the Assyrians and Babylonians, even after the destruction of the Temple, the life of the seed was attested by the fruit it bore. *SEE CAPTIVITY; SEE PROPHECY*.

Rabbinism. — When the political existence of the Jews was annihilated, they nerved themselves, with that determination characteristic of the Hebrew race, for another and more determined strife. In consequence of their dispersion as a nation, after the Babylonian exile the Mosaic constitution could be but partially reestablished. "The whole building was too much shattered, and its fragments too widely dispersed, to reunite in their ancient and regular form." But from his captivity the Jew had brought with him a reverential, or, rather, a passionate attachment to the Mosaic

law and the consecration of the second Temple, and the reestablishment of the state had been accompanied by the ready and solemn recognition of the law. The synagogue was instituted, and with it many of the institutions which have tended to perpetuate Judaism to the present hour. One of the most important of these was the constant interpretation of the law and the prophets; and as the acquaintance with the law became more intimate, the attachment to it grew deeper and deeper in the national character, until it finally was not only their Bible and statute book, but a guide for the most minute details of common life. "But no written law can provide for all possible exigencies; whether general and comprehensive, or minute and multifarious, it equally requires the expositor to adapt it to the immediate case which may occur, either before the public tribunal or that of the private conscience. Hence the law became a deep and intricate study. Learning in the law became the great distinction to which all alike paid reverential homage. Public and private affairs depended on the sanction of this self formed spiritual aristocracy... Every duty of life, of social intercourse between man and man, not to speak of its weightier authority as the national code of criminal and civil jurisprudence, was regulated by an appeal to the book of the law" (Milman, *History of the Jews*, 2, 417). Thus arose the office of the rabbis — the clergy, the learned interpreters of the law, the public instructors, to whom, by degrees, also the spiritual authority was transferred from the priesthood. At this time, also, besides the inspired Scriptures, traditional writings became another ground of authority over the public mind. *SEE TRADITION*. This was not, however, as universally acknowledged, and gave rise to that schism in Judaism which originated the *Karaites* (q.v.). Thus Judaism had fortified itself after the captivity, so that when the Temple was finally again destroyed, and public worship became extinct, Rabbinism was able to supplant the original religion of the Jews, and from amid the blackened walls of Jerusalem rose, ere the smoke of the ruins had yet ceased, a new bond of national union. the great distinctive feature in the character of modern Judaism. With the Masora (q.v.) also came soon after the Mishna (q.v.) and the Gemara, which together form the Babylonian Talmud, *SEE TALMUD*; that wonderful monument of human industry formulated Mosaism — which to the Jew "became the magic circle within which the national mind patiently labored for ages in performing the bidding of the ancient and mighty enchanters, who drew the sacred line beyond which it might not venture to pass" (Milman), and which so securely enwrapped the Jewish idea in almost infinite rules and laws that it completely sheltered it from polluting

contact in the succeeding dark ages. It is thus that Judaism, weathering many a long and severe storm, has continued to prosper, and flourishes even in our own day.

Sects. — In the early age of Judaism we saw that the simple worship of a supreme Being constituted its peculiar characteristic. At that time, as a sign of the covenant of Abraham with the Lord, the rite of *circumcision* (q.v.) was introduced, and was soon followed by the formal institution of sacrifice. In the period of Mosaism the Jewish belief became an established form of religion, and then were introduced certain ceremonies and feast days, together with the priesthood. In the Rabbinic period, as the law became overlaid by tradition, discussions arose, and the Jews were divided into three principal sects — the Pharisees (q.v.), who placed religion in external ceremony; the Sadducees (q.v.), who were remarkable for their incredulity; and the Essenes (q.v.), whose peculiar distinction was the practice of austere sanctity. Still later sprang up other sects; prominently among these are the *Karaites*, the strict adherents to the letter of the law, the opponents of rabbinical interpretations. For a review of Jewish literature, *SEE RABBINISM*.

Modern Judaism. — In the history of the Jews (q.v.) we have seen how greatly the condition of this people was ameliorated about the close of the 18th century by the influence of Moses Mendelssohn. But not only in their civil condition did his efforts affect the Jews; he also greatly changed the character of Judaism itself. With him originated a tendency of thought and action, which has since spread among the leaders of Judaism generally, to weaken rabbinical authority, and to maintain a more simple Biblical Judaism. These have now been developed into two special phases of Jewish opinion, which are represented by the terms "*Conservative*" (or Moderate Orthodox) and "*Reformed*" (or Liberal) Judaism. (See each of these titles below.)

General Creed. — A summary of the religious views of the Jews was first compiled in the 11th century by the second great Moses (Maimonides), and it continues to be with the Orthodox the Jewish confession of faith to the present day. It is as follows:

1. I believe, with a true and perfect faith, that God is the creator (whose name be blessed), governor, and maker of all creatures; and that he hath wrought all things, worketh, and shall work forever.

- 2.** I believe, with perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is one; and that such a unity as is in him can be found in none other; and that he alone hath been our God, is, and forever shall be.
- 3.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is not corporeal, not to be comprehended with any bodily properties; and that there is no bodily essence that can be likened unto him.
- 4.** I believe, with a perfect faith, the Creator (whose name be blessed) to be the first and the last; that nothing was before him, and that he shall abide the last forever.
- 5.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is to be worshipped, and none else.
- 6.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the words of the prophets are true.
- 7.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that the prophecies of Moses our master (may he rest in peace!) were true; that he was the father and chief of all wise men that lived before him, or ever shall live after him.
- 8.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the law which at this day is found in our hands was delivered by God himself to our master Moses (God's peace be with him!).
- 9.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that the same law is never to be changed, nor any other to be given us of God (whose name be blessed).
- 10.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that God (whose name be blessed) understandeth all the works and thoughts of men, as it is written in the prophets; he fashioneth their hearts alike, he understandeth all their works.
- 11.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that God (whose name be blessed) will recompense good to them that keep his commandments, and will punish them who transgress them.
- 12.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Messiah is yet to come; and although he retard his coming, yet I will wait for him till he come.
- 13.** I believe, with a perfect faith, that the dead shall be restored to life when it shall seem fit unto God the creator (whose name be blessed, and memory celebrated without end. Amen).

Doctrine of immortality. — In regard to the future life, they believe in reward and punishment, but, like the Universalists (q.v.), the Jews believe in the ultimate salvation of all men. Like the Roman Catholics, *SEE PURGATORY*, the Jews offer up prayers for the souls of their deceased friends (comp. Alger, *Hist. Doctr. Future Life*, chap. 8 and 9).

Sacrifice. — Since the destruction of their Temple and their dispersion the sacrifices have been discontinued, but in all other respects the Mosaic dispensation is observed intact among the Orthodox Jews.

Worship. — Their divine worship consists in the reading of the Scriptures and prayer. But while they (do not insist on attendance at the synagogue, they enjoin all to say their prayers at home, or in any place where circumstances may place them, three times a day — morning, afternoon, and evening; they repeat also blessings and particular praises to God, aside from them, at their meals and on many other occasions.

In their morning devotions they use the *phylacteries* (q.v.) and the *Talith*, except Saturdays, when they use the Talith only. *SEE FRINGE*.

Calendar. — The Jewish year is either *civil* or *ecclesiastical*. The civil year commences in the month of Tisri, which falls into some part of our September, on the view that the world was created on the first day of this month (Tisri). The ecclesiastical year commences about the vernal equinox, in the month of Nisan, the latter part of our month of March and the first half of April. The seventh month of the civil year they call the first of the ecclesiastical year, because this was enjoined upon them at their departure from Egypt (^{GENI}Numbers 28:11). *SEE CALENDAR*.

Feast Days. — The feasts which they observe at present are the following:

1. *Passover*, on the 14th of Nisan, and lasting eight days. On the evening before the feast the first born of every family observes a fast in remembrance of God's mercy toward the nation. They eat at this feast unleavened bread, and observe as strict holidays the two first and last days.
2. *Pentecost*, or the Feast of Weeks, falling seven weeks after the Passover, is at present celebrated only two days.
3. *Trumpets*, on the 1st and 2d of Tisri, of which the first is called New year's day. On the second day is read the 22d chapter of Genesis, which gives an account of Abraham's offering of his son Isaac and God's blessing

on him and his seed. Then they blow the trumpet, or, more accurately, the *horn*, and pray, as usual, that God would bring them to Jerusalem.

4. *Tabernacles*, on the 15th of Tisri, and lasting nine days; the first and the last two days being observed as feast days, and the other four as days of labor. On the first day they take branches of palm, myrtle, willow, and citron bound together, and go around the altar or pulpit singing psalms, because this ceremony was formerly performed at their Temple. On the seventh day of the festival they take copies of the *torah*, or law of Moses, out of the ark, and carry them to the altar, and all the congregation follow in procession seven times around the altar, in remembrance of the Sabbatical year, singing the 29th Psalm. On the evening of this day the feast of *solemn assembly, or of rejoicing*, commences. They read passages from the law and the prophets, and entreat the Lord to be propitious to them, and deliver them from captivity. On the ninth day they repeat several prayers in honor of the law, and bless God for his mercy and goodness in giving it to them by his servant Moses, and read that part of the Scriptures which makes mention of his death.

5. *Purim*, on the 14th and 15th of Adar (or March), in commemoration of the deliverance from Haman (~~1700~~ Esther 9). The whole book of Esther is read repeatedly, with liberal almsgiving to the poor.

6. Besides these festivals appointed by Moses and Mordecai, they celebrate the *dedication of the altar*, in commemoration of the victory over Antiochus Epiphanes. This festival lasts eight days, and is appointed to be kept by lighting lamps. The reason they assign for this is that, at this purification and rededication of the Temple after the deliverance from Antiochus, there was not enough of pure oil left to burn one night, but that it miraculously lasted *eight* days, when they obtained a fresh supply.

7. *Expiation day*, the 10th day of Tisri, is observed by the Jews, though they have neither temple nor priest. Before the feast they seek to reestablish friendly relations with their neighbors, and, in short, do everything that may serve to evince the sincerity of their repentance. For twenty four hours they observe a strict fast, and many a pious soul does not quit the synagogue during these long hours, but remains in prayer through the night. *SEE FESTIVAL.*

Mission and Preservation of the Jews. — The preservation of the Jews as a distinct nation, notwithstanding the miseries which they have endured for

many ages, is a wonderful fact. The religions of other nations have depended on temporal prosperity for their duration; they have triumphed under the protection of conquerors, and have fallen and given place to others under a succession of weak monarchs. Paganism once overspread the known world, even where it no longer exists. The Christian Church, glorious in her martyrs, has survived the persecution of her enemies, though she cannot heal the wounds they have inflicted; but Judaism, hated and persecuted for so many centuries, has not merely escaped destruction, it has been powerful and flourishing. Kings have employed the severity of laws and the hand of the executioner to eradicate it, and a seditious populace have injured it by their massacres more than kings. Sovereigns and their subjects, pagans, Christians, and Mohammedans, opposed to each other in everything else, have formed, a common design to annihilate this nation without success. The bush of Moses has always continued burning, and never been consumed. The expulsion of the Jews from the great cities of kingdoms has only scattered them throughout the world. They have lived from age to age in wretchedness, and their blood has flowed freely in persecution; they have continued to our day, in spite of the disgrace and hatred which everywhere clung to them, while the greatest empires have fallen and been almost forgotten. Every Jew is at this moment a living witness to the Christian as to the authenticity of his own religion, an undeniable evidence that Christianity is the last revelation from God; and the patient endurance of the descendants of Abraham is an evidence that Providence has guarded them throughout all their miseries. Hence the Christian should regard with compassion a people so long preserved by this peculiar care amidst calamities which would have destroyed any other nation. "I would look at the ceremonies of pagan worship," says Dr. Richardson, "as a matter of little more than idle curiosity, but those of the Jews reach the heart. This is the most ancient form of worship in existence; this is the manner in which the God of heaven was worshipped when all the other nations in the world were sitting in darkness, or falling down to stocks and stones. To the Jews were committed the oracles of God. This is the manner in which Moses and Elias, David and Solomon, worshipped the God of their fathers; this worship was instituted by God himself. The time will come when the descendants of his ancient people shall join the song of Moses to the song of the Lamb, and, singing hosannas to the son of David, confess his power to save."

Restoration of the Jews. — The Jews, as is well known, deny the accomplishment of the prophecies in the person of Jesus. The Reformed Jews (see below) deny the promise of a personal Messiah altogether; but the orthodox, the greater part of the Jews, hold that the Messiah has not yet come, but that they will be redeemed at the *appointed time*, when he of whom the prophets spoke shall make his appearance in great worldly pomp and grandeur, subduing all nations, and restoring the scepter of universal rule to the house of Judah. Then there shall reign universal peace and happiness in all the earth, never again to be interrupted, and to the Jewish fold shall return those of the flock that strayed into the Christian and Mohammedan folds; then idolatry shall cease in the world, and all men acknowledge the unity of God and his kingdom. (Comp. ³⁴⁹Zechariah 14:9, "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.") This restoration shall be effected, not on account of any merits of their own, but for the Lord's sake; so as to secure their own righteousness, and the perfection to which they shall attain after their deliverance. (Atonement for sin is made by the fulfilling of the law and by circumcision, and not, as the Christian holds, by the sacrifice of the Messiah.) For the Christian doctrine of the Restoration of the Jews, *SEE RESTORATION.*

Judaism, Conservative.

The gradual emancipation of the Jews in Germany, which, however, did not become final anywhere until 1848, and which was rendered complete in Bavaria so recently as 1866, insensibly diminished the influence of Talmudical studies and of Rabbinical lore as the paramount obligation of life. Compelled, happily, to bear their own share in their deliverance from oppression, the Jews became more and more attached to the land of their nativity, and more and more estranged from the traditional allegiance to the kingdom of Israel. Their love for Palestine, intense and impassioned as ever, has assumed a different form. Their union and fellowship no longer represented a nationality yearning to be released from captivity, but settled down into the indissoluble affection of race and a common faith, not inconsistent with ties of citizenship in the world.

In 1807, when Napoleon convened the so called Jewish Sanhedrim, with a view of establishing the relations between the empire and the Jews resident in France, the first official and authoritative expression of the transformed Jewish sentiment was published. In effect, it was a defense of the Jew who

had for centuries been denied the rights of man, and pronounced unfit for citizenship. It declared that the Jews of France recognize in the fullest sense the French people as their brethren; that France is their country; that the Jews of France recognize as paramount the laws of the land, and their religious tribunals have no authority in conflict with the civil courts and national laws; that the Talmud enjoins the pursuit of a useful trade and prohibits usury; that polygamy is forbidden and divorce permitted.

The Jews of France were equal to the promise of the Sanhedrim. They proved good citizens, and faithfully adhered to their distinct religious belief and practice. The chief rabbi of France has been recognized as of corresponding dignity with the archbishop of Paris, and in the distribution of state aid to ecclesiastical institutions the Jews have been admitted to their proportionate share. The Jews of France, like those of Great Britain and Holland, are Conservative. The form of worship has not materially changed to this day. The Portuguese ritual is followed at one of the Paris synagogues, as at London and Amsterdam. The German or Polish ritual is otherwise the rule..

In Great Britain about the year 1842, the keynote of progress was struck by a Jewish congregation at London, followed by that of Manchester. There are now only two congregations in the United Kingdom denying the authority of the chief rabbi. In Great Britain, France, and Holland there exists a recognized ecclesiastical authority. The administration of religious affairs is conducted nearly upon the Episcopal system. The spirit of the churches in these three countries is extremely conservative. Nevertheless, great latitude is allowed to individual believers, and what would have been regarded as capital sins a century ago are considered trivial today. It may be said that the Jews have thoroughly assimilated themselves to the rest of the population. In France their conservatism is formal rather than substantial, and the nonconformist is treated with great liberality. That he violates the sanctity of the Jewish Sabbath is not necessarily a disqualification for high office in the congregation. The ministers are, expected to live consistently with their professions: the laity are not sharply criticized. In England conservatism is decided, authoritative, uncompromising. Nonconformists are on sufferance, and are rarely allowed a voice in the administration of synagogal affairs. In Holland liberty has dealt kindly with the Jewish people, who are prominent in the state and in commerce, in science, in learning, and in art, and are at once conservative and tolerant in their religious views, while consistent in the conduct of the

synagogue. There are successful Conservative colleges or theological seminaries at Paris, London; Amsterdam, Breslau, Berlin, and Würzburg.

Conservative Judaism is paramount in Belgium and Italy, and has held its own in some parts of Austria also. The great Rapoport (q.v.) of Prague, one of the finest scholars of that century, may be regarded as the type of the intelligent Conservative Jew who loved the Judaism of the past with fervor and intensity, but recognized as the duty of the present hour the preparation of his brethren for their place in the world at length grudgingly accorded them.

The Judaism of Poland and Russia, as of Palestine and the other Asiatic and the African countries, can scarcely be denominated Conservative. It is strictly stationary. Education has not yet been sufficiently diffused among the masses to enable them intelligently to comprehend the differences or points of unity in Judaism, conservative or progressive. The study of the Talmud is still pursued with ardor in every Polish village, but the spirit of Judaism is not as potent as the maintenance of form or of scholastic authority. Conservative Judaism has no history in these countries, yet its scholars have done the world a service in the preservation of Hebrew literature, and in rescuing from oblivion ancient thought so peculiarly habited and disguised. It is worthy of note that the chief rabbi at Jerusalem preserves great state, and is regarded as a functionary of signal consequence, but the institutions of learning within his jurisdiction are mainly sustained by the benevolence of European and American Jews.

The Hebrews in the United States number about half a million. Their material progress has been extraordinary. They comprise at present some three hundred congregations, of which full one half came to this country only within the last twelve years. The synagogues rival the most beautiful and costly churches in the principal cities. In 1840 there were scarcely ten thousand Jews and not more than a dozen congregations in the United States. Their synagogues now number two hundred and fifty. The Conservative ministry is not strong. Only recently has any active interest been displayed in the higher Hebrew education, the preparation of candidates for clerical stations. Maimonides College, established in 1866 at Philadelphia, has not been successful in the number of students, although its faculty is scholarly and energetic. The Conservative pulpit is ably supplied in several synagogues of New York, Philadelphia, and New

Orleans. In other cities the leading scholars are of the progressive or Reform school.

The policy of Conservative American Israelites does not favor ecclesiastical authority. Occasionally efforts have been made to, perfect a union of synagogues; but they have uniformly failed when doctrinal or ritual questions were the points to be determined in convention. The tendency is clearly in favor of independent synagogues, united for purposes of a charitable, educational, or semi-political character — otherwise recognizing no will or exposition of Jewish doctrine superior to that of their respective ministers or secular officials. The cooperative movements for aiding oppressed Israelites in foreign countries, and for repressing anticipated danger or checking legal discriminations at home, resulting in the establishment of the "Board of Delegates of American Israelites," are not confined to the Conservative or to the Progressive congregations. Doctrinal questions are eschewed in this organization, which is purely voluntary, and assumes no authority except what may be delegated from time to time to interpret the sentiments of American Israelites.

The Conservatives have of late years paid attention to religious education. Elementary schools are attached to most congregations, and in New York a society was formed in 1865 for the gratuitous instruction in Hebrew and in English, of children whose parents are not attached to any synagogue, or are unable to contribute to its support. (M.S.L.)

Judaism, Reformed,

also called *progressive* or *modern* Judaism, is the Jewish religion as reformed in the 19th century in Germany, Austria, America, and in some congregations of France and England. The places of worship are called temples, distinguished from other Jewish synagogues by choir, organ, regular sermons, and part of the liturgy in the vernacular of the country, and in America also by family pews. The ministers of these temples are rabbis who have attained proficiency in Hebrew lore, and are graduates of colleges or universities; or preachers by the choice of the congregation, who are mostly autodidactic students; and cantors, capable of reading the divine service and leading the choir. In some congregations the offices of preacher and cantor are united in one person. Large congregations are conducted by the ordained rabbi and the cantor: the former is the expounder of the law, and the latter presides over the worship, and is also called *Hazan*, or *Reader* (q.v.). Every congregation elects secular officers

to conduct the temporal affairs. The ministers are elected by the congregation for a stated period. A school for instruction in religion, Hebrew, and Jewish history is attached to every temple. Like all other Jews, the reformed also are unitarian in theology, and acknowledge the Old Testament Scriptures as the divine source of law and doctrine, but reject the additional authority of the Talmud, in place of which they appeal to reason and conscience as the highest authority in expounding the Scriptures. They believe in the immortality of the soul, future reward and punishment, the perfectibility of human nature, the final and universal triumph of truth and righteousness. They reject the belief in the coming of a Messiah; the gathering of the Hebrew people to Palestine to form a separate government, and to restore the ancient polity of animal sacrifices and the Levitical priesthood; the resurrection of the body and the last judgment day; and the authority of the Talmud above any other collection of commentaries to the Bible. All these doctrines are expressed in their prayer books and catechisms. Their hermeneutics is rationalistic. They reject the evidence of miracles, relying exclusively upon the internal evidence of the Scriptures, and the common consent of all civilized nations to the divinity of the scriptural laws and doctrines. Except in the case of Moses, of whom the Scriptures testify, "Mouth to mouth I speak unto him," the appearance and speaking of angels, as also the appearance and speaking of God, were subjective, in the vision, waking or dreaming, appearing objectively to the prophet, which was not the case in reality. In this respect they follow the guide of Moses Maimonides. *SEE PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGICAL, OF THE JEWS.* In respect to doctrine, they hold that all religious doctrines must be taken from the Bible, and must be in harmony with the loftiest and purest conceptions of the Deity and humanity suggested by the Scriptures, and confirmed by reason and conscience. In respect to law, they hold that all laws contained in the Decalogue, expressed or implied, are obligatory forever, both in letter or spirit. All laws not contained in the Decalogue, expressed or implied, are local and temporal (although the principle expressed by some may be eternal) and could have been intended for certain times and localities only. These theories of Judaism were developed by various Jewish authors between the years 1000 and 1500; partly they are also in the ancient Rabbinical literature, but were dropped after 1500, and taken up again by the disciples and successors of Moses Mendelssohn toward the close of the last century, and gradually developed to the present system. (I.M.W.)

From a few late articles in the *Israelite* (Nov. 1871), by the distinguished writer of the above article on *Reformed Judaism*, we learn that he regards as the first reformer in the camp of Judaism the celebrated gaon Saadia (q.v.) ben-Joseph, of Fayum, who flourished in the first half of the 10th century"; as the second, the famous body physician of the caliph of Cairo, *Rambam*, "the classical Moses Maimonides." Of perhaps minor influence, but also as active in the field of reform, he introduces us next to Bechai ben-Joseph, of Saragossa, and Ibn-Gebirol (q.v.), of Malaga, who flourished in the 11th century. He even counts among the reformers the celebrated French rabbi Isaac, of Troyes, better known under the surname of *Rashi* (q.v.); and on the side of reform or progressive Judaism are also ranked by Dr. Wise the celebrated Jewish savants Judah ha-Levy (q.v.), Aben-Ezra (q.v.), and Abraham ben-David; the celebrated author of the *Emmeah Ramah* (Exalted Faith), who fell a victim to fanaticism in A.D. 1180 at Toledo, in Spain, and with whom close up the two centuries that elapsed between the appearance of Saadia and Maimonides, in which days "all [Jewish] philosophy had become peripatetic," the Jewish philosophical writers of this period considering their main object "the self defense of Judaism on the one hand, and the expounding of the Bible and Talmud as rational as possible, in order to reconcile and harmonize faith and reason."

With the 13th century undoubtedly opens a new epoch in Judaism, for it is here that we encounter the great Jewish master mind Moses Maimonides, of whom it has been truly said that "from Moses [the lawgiver] to Moses [Mendelssohn] there was none like Moses [Maimonides]." Since the days of Ezra, no man has exerted so deep, universal, and lasting an influence on Jews and Judaism as this man, and we need not wonder that Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed Jews alike lay claim to this master mind; but it must be confessed that, after all, he really belongs to the Progressive Jews only. It is true the creed drawn up by the second Moses is now the possession of all Jews, and the Orthodox cling to it with even more tenacity than the Conservatives and the Reformed, but his theologico-philosophical works gained authority mainly among the Reformed thinkers of the Judaistic faith. After that date, of course, Jewish literature abounds with names whose productions betray a rationalistic tendency, for "all Jewish thinkers up to date, Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, and the writers of the 19th century included, are more or less the disciples of Maimonides, so that no Jewish theologico-philosophical book, from and after 1200, can be picked up in which the ideas of Maimonides do not form

a prominent part." In our own days the Reform movement first became very prominent. In Germany, where Judaism has always been strong on account of the high literary attainments of the German Jews, the separation between the Orthodox and Reformed, and the establishment of independent Reformed congregations first originated, and the celebrated Holdheim (q.v.) was among the first as pastor of a *temple* in 1846. Other Jewish rabbis of note, identified with the Reform movement in Germany, are Stein, of Frankfurt-on-the-Main; Einhorn, now of New York City, Deutsch, now of Baltimore, Md.; and Ritter, the successor of Holdheim, and historian of the Reform agitation. In the U. States those prominently identified with the Reform question are Drs. Adler and Gutheim, of the Fifth Avenue Temple, New York City; Mr. Ellinger, editor of the *Jewish Times*, New York City; Dr. Lewin, of Brooklyn, editor of the *New Era*; Dr. Isaac M. Wise, editor of the *Israelite*, etc. See Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums u. Sekten*, 3, 349 sq. Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10; Ritter, *Gesch. d. jüd. Reformation* (Berlin, 3 vols. 8vo); Geiger, *Judaism and its History*, Engl. trans. by M. Mayer (N.Y. 1870 8vo); Astruc (the grand rabbi of Belgium), *Histoire abrege des Juifs et de leur croyance* (Paris, 1869); Raphael, D. C. Lewin, *What is Judaism* (N.Y. 1871, 12mo); *New Era*, May, 1871, art. 1; *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* April, 1869; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Literature*, 8; *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct. 1870; and the works cited in the article JEWS. (J.H.W.)

Judaizing Christians

a term frequently employed to designate a class of early Christians, of whom traces appear in the N.T. epistles, and still more distinctly in the succeeding century. They are believed to have been converts from Judaism, who still clung to the Mosaic institutions, particularly circumcision. They appear to have been of two classes, some considering the ceremonial law as binding only upon Christians descended from the Jews, while others looked upon it as obligatory also for the heathen. The headquarters of the Judaizing Christians is said to have been first at Antioch. The council held at Jerusalem decided that the heathen should not be subject to circumcision. The more zealous Judaizing Christians, thus opposed by the apostles, abandoned Palestine, and went about trying to convert the heathen to their views, but with little success. They were probably the "false apostles," persons "brought in unawares," etc., so often mentioned by Paul, and are known in history, the more moderate as NAZARENES *SEE NAZARENES* (q.v.), the others as EBIONITES *SEE EBIONITES*

(q.v.). See D. van Heyst, *De Jud. Christianismo* (1828). — Pieter, *Universal Lexikon*, 9, 159.

Ju'das

(**Ἰούδας**), the Graecized form of the Hebrew name *Judah*, and generally retained in the A.V. of the Apocrypha and N.T., as also in Josephus, where it occurs of a considerable number of men. *SEE JUDA*; *SEE JUDE*.

1. The patriarch JUDAH *SEE JUDA* (q.v.), son of Jacob (^{<400>}Matthew 1:2, 3).
2. One of the Levites who renounced his Gentile wife after the captivity (1 Esdr. 9:23); the JUDAH of ^{<450>}Ezra 10:23.
3. The third son of Mattathias, and the leading one of the three Maccabaeian brothers (1 Macc. 2:4, etc.). *SEE MACCABEES*.
4. The son of Calphi (Alphaeus), a Jewish general under Jonathan Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 11:70).
5. A Jew occupying a conspicuous position at Jerusalem at the time of the mission to Aristobulus (q.v.) and the Egyptian Jews (2 Macc. 1:10). He is thought by some to have been the same with
6. An aged person, and a noted teacher among the Essenes at Jerusalem, famous for his art of predicting events, which was confirmed in a remarkable manner by the death of Antigonus (q.v.) at the order of his brother Aristobulus, as related by Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 11, 2; *War*, 1, 3, 5).
7. A son of Simon, and brother of John Hyrcanus (1 Macc. 16:2), murdered by Ptolemaeus the usurper, either at the same time (B.C. cir. 135) with his father (1 Macc. 16:15 sq.), or shortly afterwards (Josephus *Ant.* 13, 8, 1; see Grimm, *ad Macc.* l. c.). — Smith.
8. Son of one Ezechias (which latter was famous for his physical strength), and one of the three principal bandits mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 17, 10, 2; *War*, 2, 4, 1) as infesting Palestine in the early days of Herod. This person, whom Whitson (ad loc.) regards as the Theudas (q.v.) of Luke (^{<410>}Acts 10:36), temporarily got possession of Sepphoris, in Galilee. What became of him does not particularly appear, but it may be presumed. he shared the fate of the others named in the same connection.

9. Son of one Saripheus, or Sepphoris, and one of the two eminent Jewish teachers who incited their young disciples to demolish the golden eagle erected by Herod over the Temple gate, an act of sedition for which the whole party were burned alive (Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 6, 2-4; *War*, 1, 33, 2-4).

10. A person surnamed "*the Galilean*" (ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, ^{<487>}Acts 5:37), so called also by Josephus (*Ant.* 18, 1, 6; 20, 5, 2; *War*, 2, 8, 1), and likewise "*the Gaulonite*" (ὁ Γαυλονίτης, *Ant.* 18, 1, 1). He was born at Gamala, a fortified city on the Sea of Galilee, in Lower Gaulonitis; and after the deposition of Archelaus, during the thirty-seventh year after the battle of Actium (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 2, 1), i.e. A.D. 6, he excited a violent insurrection among the Jews, in concert with a well known Pharisee named Sadok, against the Roman government exercised by the procurator Coponius, on occasion of a census levied by the emperor Augustus, asserting the popular doctrine that the Jews ought to acknowledge no dominion but that of God. He was destroyed, and his followers scattered by Cyrenius, then proconsul of Syria and Judaea. We also learn from Josephus that the scattered remnant of the party of Judas continued after his destruction to work on still in secret, and labored to maintain his free spirit and reckless principles among the people (Josephus, *War*, 2, 17, 7-19). (See E. A. Schulze, *Dissert. de Juda Galileo ejusque secta*, Frankf. A.V. 1761; also in his *Exercit. philosoph. fasc. non.* p. 104.) **SEE SICARII.**

11. Son of Simon (^{<487>}John 6:71; 13:2, 26), surnamed (always in the other Gospels) ISCARIOT, to distinguish him from the other apostle of the same name. **SEE JUDE.** In addition to this epithet the Evangelists usually distinguish him by some allusion to his treachery toward his Master.

I. *Signification of the Surname.* — The epithet Iscariot (Ἰσκαριώτης) has received many interpretations more or less conjectural.

(1) From *Kerioth* (^{<485>}Joshua 15:25), in the tribe of Judah, the Heb. *t/yrəḫ vyəḫ* *Ish-Kerioth*', passing into Ἰσκαριώτης in the same way as b/f *vyəḫ* — *Ish-Tob*, "a man of Tob" — appears in Josephus (*Ant.* 7, 6, 1) as Ἰστωβος. In connection with this explanation may be noticed the reading of some MSS. in ^{<487>}John 6:71, ἀπὸ Καριώτου, and that received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, which makes the name Iscariot belong to Simon, and not, as elsewhere, to Judas only. On this hypothesis, his position among the Twelve, the rest of whom belonged to Galilee (^{<487>}Acts

2:7), would be exceptional; and this is perhaps an additional reason why this locality is noted. This is the most common and probable opinion. *SEE KERIOTH.*

(2) From *Kartha* (A.V. "Kartan," ^{קרתא}Joshua 21:32), in Galilee (so Ewald, *Gesch. Israels*, 5, 321).

(3) As equivalent to *Issacharite*, or *Ἰσαχαριώτης* (Grotius on ^{Ἰσάχαρι}Matthew 10:4; Hermann, *Miscell. Groning.* 3, 598).

(4) From the *date trees* (*καριωτίδες*) in the neighborhood of Jerusalem or Jericho (Bartolocci, *Bibl. Rabbin.* 3, 10; Gill, *Comm. on Matthew* 10, 4).

(5) From *ayfr/qsa* (= *scortea*, Gill, 1.c.), a *leathern apron*, the name being applied to him as the bearer of the bag, and = "Judas with the apron" (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Matt.* 10:4).

(6) From *arksa*, *ascara* = *strangling* (angina), as given after his death, and commemorating it (Lightfoot, 1. c.), or indicating that he had been subject to a disease tending to suffocation previously (Heinsius, in Suicer, *Thes.* s.v. *Ἰούδας*). This is mentioned also as a meaning of the name by Origen, *Tract. in Matt.* 35.

II. Personal Notices. — Of the life of Judas, before the appearance of his name in the lists of the apostles. We know absolutely nothing. It must be left to the sad vision of a poet (Keble, *Lyra Innocentium*, 2, 13) or the fantastic fables of an apocryphal Gospel (Thilo, *Cod. Apoc. N.T., Evang. Infant.* c. 35) to portray the infancy and youth of the traitor. His call as an apostle implies, however, that he had previously declared himself a disciple. He was drawn, as the others were, by the preaching of the Baptist, or his own Messianic hopes, or the "gracious words" of the new teacher, to leave his former life, and to obey the call of the Prophet of Nazareth. What baser and more selfish motives may have mingled even then with his faith and zeal we can only judge by reasoning backwards from the sequel. Gifts of some kind there must have been, rendering the choice of such a man not strange to others, not unfit in itself, and the function which he exercised afterwards among the Twelve may indicate what they were. The position of his name, uniformly the last in the lists of the apostles in the Synoptic Gospels, is due, it may be imagined, to the infamy which afterwards rested on his name, but, prior to that guilt, it would seem that he externally differed in no marked particular from the other apostles, and he doubtless

exercised the same mission of preaching and miracles as the rest (~~<400>~~ Matthew 10:4; 26:14-47; ~~<405>~~ Mark 3:19; 14:10, 43; ~~<406>~~ Luke 6:16; 22:3, 47, 48; ~~<407>~~ John 6:71; 12:4; 13:2, 26; 14:22; 18:2, 3). A.D. 27.

The germs (see Stier's *Words of Jesus*, at the passages where Judas is mentioned) of the evil, in all likelihood, unfolded themselves gradually. The rules to which the Twelve were subject in their first journey (~~<400>~~ Matthew 10:9, 10) sheltered him from the temptation that would have been most dangerous to him. The new form of life, of which we find the traces in ~~<408>~~ Luke 8:3, brought that temptation with it. As soon as the Twelve were recognized as a body, traveling hither and thither with their Master, receiving money and other offerings, and redistributing what they received to the poor, it became necessary that some one should act as the steward and almoner of the small society, and this fell to Judas (~~<409>~~ John 12:6; 13:29), either as having the gifts that qualified him for it, or, as we may conjecture, from his character, because he sought it, or, as some have imagined, in rotation from time to time. The Galilaean or Judaeian peasant (we have no reason for thinking that his station differed from that of the other apostles) found himself intrusted with larger sums of money than before (the three hundred denarii of ~~<410>~~ John 12:5 are spoken of as a sum which he might reasonably have expected), and with this there came covetousness, unfaithfulness, embezzlement. It was impossible after this that he could feel at ease with one who asserted so clearly and sharply the laws of faithfulness, duty, unselfishness; and the words of Jesus, "Have I not chosen you Twelve, and one of you is a devil?" (~~<411>~~ John 6:70) indicate that even then, though the greed of immediate or the hope of larger gain kept him from "going back," as others did (~~<412>~~ John 6:66), hatred was taking the place of love, and leading him on to a fiendish malignity. The scene at Bethany (~~<413>~~ John 12:1-9; ~~<414>~~ Matthew 26:6-13; ~~<415>~~ Mark 14:3-9) showed how deeply the canker had eaten into his soul. The warm outpouring of love calls forth no sympathy. He utters himself, and suggests to others, the complaint that it is a waste. Under the plea of caring for the poor he covers his own miserable theft.

The narrative of ~~<416>~~ Matthew 16, ~~<417>~~ Mark 14, places this history in close connection (apparently in order of time) with the fact of the betrayal. During the days that intervened between the supper at Bethany and the paschal or quasi-paschal gathering, he appeared to have concealed his treachery. He went with the other disciples to and fro from Bethany to Jerusalem, and looked on the acted parable of the barren and condemned

tree (^{<4117>}Mark 11:20-24), and shared the vigils in Gethsemane (^{<3812>}John 18:2). At the beginning of the Last Supper he is present, looking forward to the consummation of his guilt as drawing nearer every hour. All is at first as if he were still faithful. He is admitted to the feast. His feet are washed, and for him there are the fearful words, "Ye are clean, but not all." At some point during the meal (see below) come the sorrowful words which showed him that his design was known. "One of you shall betray me." Others ask, in their sorrow and confusion, "Is it I?" He, too, must ask the same question, lest he should seem guilty (^{<4165>}Matthew 26:25). He alone hears the answer. John only, and through him Peter, and the traitor himself, understand the meaning of the act which pointed out that he was the guilty one (^{<3136>}John 13:26). After this there comes on him that paroxysm and insanity of guilt as of one whose human soul was possessed by the Spirit of Evil — "Satan entered into him" (^{<3137>}John 13:27). The words, "What thou doest, do quickly," come as a spur to drive him on. The other disciples see in them only a command which they interpret as connected with the work he had hitherto undertaken. Then he completes the sin from which even those words might have drawn him back. He knows that garden in which his Master and his companions had so often rested after the weary work of the day. He comes accompanied by a band of officers and servants (^{<3183>}John 18:3), with the kiss which was probably the usual salutation of the disciples. The words of Jesus, calm and gentle as they were, showed that this was what embittered the treachery, and made the suffering it inflicted more acute (^{<2248>}Luke 22:48).

What followed in the confusion of that night the Gospels do not record. Not many students of the N.T. will follow Heumann and archbishop Whately (*Essays on Dangers*) in the hypothesis that Judas was "the other disciple" that was known to the high priest, and brought Peter in (comp. Meyer on ^{<3185>}John 18:15). It is probable enough, indeed, that he who had gone out with the high priest's officers should return with them to wait the issue of the trial. Then, when it was over, came the reaction. The fever of the crime passed away. There came back on him the recollection of the sinless righteousness of the Master he had wronged (^{<4173>}Matthew 27:3). He feels a keen remorse, and the gold that had tempted him to it becomes hateful. He will get rid of the accursed thing, will transfer it back again to those who with it had lured him on to destruction. They mock and sneer at the tool whom they have used, and then there comes over him the horror of great darkness that precedes self murder. He has owned his sin with "an

exceeding bitter cry." but he dares not turn, with any hope of pardon, to the Master whom he has betrayed. He hurls the money, which the priests refused to take, into the sanctuary (**ναός**) where they were assembled. For him there is no longer sacrifice or propitiation. He is "the son of perdition" (~~417D~~John 17:12). "He departed, and went and hanged himself" (~~427B~~Matthew 27:5). He went "unto his own place" (~~440C~~Acts 1:25). A.D. 29. See below.

With the exception of the stories already mentioned, there are but few traditions that gather round the name of Judas. It appears, however, in a strange, hardly intelligible way in the history of the wilder heresies of the 2d century. The sect of Cainites, consistent in their inversion of all that Christians in general believed, was reported to have honored him as the only apostle that was in possession of the true *gnosis*, to have made him the object of their worship, and to have had a gospel bearing his name (comp. Neander. *Church Hist.* 2, 153; Irenaeus, *adv. Hoer.* 1, 35; Tertullian, *De Proesc.* c. 47). For the apocryphal gospel (Epiphanius, *Hoer.* 38, 1), see Fabricius, *Codex Apocr.* 1, 352. See **GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.**

III. *Our Lord's Object in his Selection as an Apostle.* — The choice was not made, we must remember, without a prevision of its issue. "Jesus knew from the beginning... who should betray him" (~~416A~~John 6:64); and the distinctness with which that evangelist records the successive stages of the guilt of Judas, and his Master's discernment of it (~~430A~~John 12:4; 13:2, 27), leaves with us the impression that he, too, shrank instinctively (Benel describes it as "singularis antipathia," *Gnomon N. Test.* on ~~416A~~John 6:64) from a nature so opposite to his own. We can hardly expect fully to solve the question why such a man was chosen for such an office, nor is it our province to sound all the depths of the divine purposes, yet we may, without presumption, raise an inquiry on this subject.

(1.) Some, on the ground of God's absolute foreknowledge, content themselves with saying, with Calvin, that the judgments of God are as a great deep, and with Ullmann (*Sundlosig. Jesu*, p. 97), that Judas was chosen in order that the divine purpose might be accomplished through him. **SEE PREDESTINATION.**

(2.) Others, less dogmatic in their views, believe, with Neander (*Leben Jesu*, § 77), that there was a discernment of the latent germs of evil, such

as belonged to the Son of Man, in his insight into the hearts of men (^{<4025>}John 2:25; ^{<4004>}Matthew 9:4; ^{<4125>}Mark 12:15), yet not such as to exclude emotions of sudden sorrow or anger (^{<4036>}Mark 3:5), or astonishment (^{<4006>}Mark 6:6; ^{<4009>}Luke 7:9), admitting the thought "with men this is impossible, but not with God." Did he, in the depth of that insight, and in the fullness of his compassion, seek to overcome the evil which, if not conquered, would be so fatal? It gives, at any rate, a new meaning and force to many parts of our Lord's teaching to remember that they must have been spoken in the hearing of Judas, and may have been designed to make him conscious of his danger. The warnings as to the impossibility of a service divided between God and mammon (^{<4009>}Matthew 6:19-34), and the destructive power, of the "cares of this world," and the "deceitfulness of riches" (^{<4122>}Matthew 12:22, 23), the pointed words that spoke of the guilt of unfaithfulness in the "unrighteous mammon" (^{<4061>}Luke 16:11), the proverb of the camel passing through the needle's eye (^{<4105>}Mark 10:25), must have fallen on his heart as meant specially for him. He was among those who asked the question, Who, then, can be saved? (^{<4005>}Mark 10:26). Of him, too, we may say that, when he sinned, he was "kicking against the pricks," letting slip his "calling and election," frustrating the purpose of his Master in giving him so high a work, and educating him for it (compare Chrysostom, *Hon. on Matt.* 26, 27, *John* 6).

(3.) But to most persons these will appear to be arbitrary or recondite arguments. Important reasons of a more practical kind, we may be sure, were not wanting for the procedure, and they are not very far to seek. The presence of such a false friend in the company of his immediate disciples was needed, first of all, to complete the circle of Christ's trials and temptations. He could not otherwise have known by personal experience some of the sharpest wounds inflicted by human perverseness and ingratitude, nor exhibited his superiority to the evil of the world in its most offensive forms. But for the deceit and treachery of Judas he would not have been in all things tempted like his brethren. Then thus only could the things undergone by his great prototype David find their proper counterpart. in him who was to enter into David's heritage, and raise from the dust David's throne. Of the things written in the Psalms concerning him — written there as derived from the depths of David's sore experience and sharp conflict with evil, but destined to meet again in a still greater than he — few have more affecting prominence given to them than those which relate to the hardened wickedness, base treachery, and reprobate condition

of a false friend, whose words were smooth as butter, but whose actions were drawn swords, who ate of his meat, but lifted up the heel against him (comp. ^{<940>}Psalm 41:9, with ^{<638>}John 13:18; and *SEE AHITOPHEL*). Other prophecies also, especially two in Zechariah (^{<302>}Zechariah 10:12, 13; 13:6), waited for their accomplishment on such a course of ingratitude and treachery as that pursued by Judas. Further, the relation in which this false but ungenial and sharp sighted disciple stood to the rectitude of Jesus afforded an important reason for his presence and agency. It was well that those who stood at a greater distance from the Savior failed to discover any fault in him; that none of them, when the hour of trial came, could convict him of sin, though the most watchful inspection had been exercised, and the most anxious efforts had been made to enable them to do so. But it was much more that even this bosom friend, who had been privy to all his counsels, and had seen him in his most unguarded moments, was equally incapable of finding any evil in him; he could betray Jesus to his enemies, but he could furnish these enemies with no proof of his criminality; nay, with the bitterness of death in his soul, he went back to testify to them that, in delivering up Jesus, he had betrayed innocent blood. What more conclusive evidence could the world have had that our Lord was indeed without spot and blameless? Finally, the appearance of such a person as Judas among the immediate attendants of Jesus was needed as an example of the strength of human depravity — how it can lurk under the most sacred professions, subsist in the holiest company, live and grow amid the clearest light, the most solemn warnings, the tenderest entreaties, and the divinest works. The instruction afforded by the incarnation and public ministry of the Son of God would not have been complete without such a memorable exhibition by its side of the darker aspects of human nature; the Church should have wanted a portion of the materials required for her future warning and admonition; and on this account also there was a valid reason for the calling of one who could act the shameful part of Judas Iscariot.

IV. *Motives of Judas in the Betrayal of his Master.* — The Scripture account leaves these to conjecture (comp. Neander, *Leben Jesu*, § 264). The mere love of money may have been strong enough to make him clutch at the bribe offered him. He came, it may be, expecting more (^{<475>}Matthew 27:15); he will take that. He has lost the chance of dealing with the three hundred denarii; it will be something to get the thirty shekels as his own. It may have been that he felt that his Master saw through his hidden guilt, and

that he hastened on a crisis to avoid the shame of open detection. Mingled with this there may have been some feeling of vindictiveness, a vague, confused desire to show that he had power to stop the career of the teacher who had reproved him. Had the words that spoke of "the burial" of Jesus, and the lukewarmness of the people, and the conspiracies of the priests, led him at last to see that the Messianic kingdom was not as the kingdoms of this world, and that his dream of power and wealth to be enjoyed in it was a delusion? (Ewald, *Gesch. Israels*, 5, 441-446). There may have been the thought that, after all, the betrayal could do no harm, that his Master would prove his innocence, or by some supernatural manifestation effect his escape (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 886; and Whitby on ^{<4170>}Matthew 27:4). Another motive has been suggested (compare Neander, *Leben Jesu*, l.c.; and Whately, *Essays on Dangers to Christian Faith*, discourse 3) of an entirely different kind, altering altogether the character of the act. Not the love of money, nor revenge, nor fear, nor disappointment, but policy, a subtle plan to force on the hour of the triumph of the Messianic kingdom, the belief that for this service he would receive as high a place as Peter or James, or John — this it was that made him the traitor. If he could place his Master in a position from which retreat would be impossible, where he would be compelled to throw himself on the people, and be raised by them to the throne of his father David, then he might look forward to being foremost and highest in that kingdom, with all his desires for wealth and power gratified to the full. Ingenious as this hypothesis is, it fails for that very reason. It attributes to the groveling peasant a subtlety in forecasting political combinations, and planning stratagems accordingly, which is hardly compatible with his character and learning, hardly consistent either with the pettiness of the faults into which he had hitherto fallen. It is characteristic of the wide, far reaching sympathy of Origen: that he suggests another motive for the suicide of Judas. Despairing of pardon in this life, he would rush on into the world of the dead, and there (γυμνῆ τ ψυχῆ) meet his Lord and confess his guilt, and ask for pardon (*Tract. in Matt.* 35; comp. also Theophanes, *Hom.* 27, in Suicer. *Thes.* s.v. Ἰούδας). Of the other motives that have been assigned we need not care to fix on any one as that which singly led him on. Crime is, for the most part, the result of a hundred motives rushing with bewildering fury through the mind of the criminal.

V. The question has often been agitated whether Judas was present at the first celebration of the Lord's supper, or left the assembly before the

institution actually took place; but with no very decisive result. The conclusion reached on either side has very commonly been determined by doctrinal prepossessions rather than by exegetical principles. The general consensus of patristic commentators gives an affirmative to the question of his partaking of the commemorative meal, that of modern critics a negative answer (comp. Meyer, *Comm. on* ^{<B136>}John 13:36). Of the three synoptic evangelists, Matthew and Mark represent the charge of an intention to betray on the part of Judas as being brought against him between the paschal feast and the supper, while Luke does not mention it till both feasts were finished; yet none of them say precisely when he left the chamber. From this surely it may be inferred that nothing very material depended on the circumstance. If Judas did leave before the commencement of the supper, it was plainly not because he was formally excluded, but because he felt it to be morally impossible to continue any longer in such company. As, however, it seems certain, from ^{<B130>}John 13:30, that he left the moment Jesus brought home the charge to him, and gave him the son, and as it is next to certain that the feast then proceeding was not that of the supper, the probabilities of the case must be held to be on the side of his previous withdrawal. The requisitions of time, too, favor the same view; since, if Judas did not leave till so late as the close of both feasts, it is scarcely possible to conceive how he should have had time to arrange with the chief priests for proceeding with the arrest of Jesus that very night. The matter in this shape came alike on him and on them by surprise; fresh consultations, therefore, required to be held, fresh measures to be adopted; and these necessarily demanded time, to the extent at least of some hours.

VI. *Alleged Discrepancy as to the Mode of Judas' Suicide.* — We have in Acts 1 another account than the above of the circumstances of his death, which some have thought it difficult to harmonize with that given by Matthew. There, in words which may have been spoken by Peter (Meyer, following the general *consensus* of interpreters), or may have been a parenthetical notice inserted by Luke (Calvin, Olshausen, and others), it is stated,

(1) That, instead of throwing the money into the Temple, he bought (ἐκτίσαστο) a field with it. As to this point, it has been said that there is a kind of irony in Peter's words, "This was all he got." A better explanation is, that what was bought with his money is spoken of as bought by him (Meyer, ad loc.).

(2) That, instead of hanging himself, "falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." On this we have two methods of reconciliation:

(a) That ἀπήγατο, in ^{<427B>}Matthew 27:5, includes death by some sudden spasm of suffocation (*angina pectoris?*), such as might be caused by the overpowering misery of his remorse, and that then came the fall described in the Acts (Suicer, *Thes.* s.v. ἀπάγω; Grotius, Hammond, Lightfoot, and others). By some this has even been connected with the name Iscariot, as implying a constitutional tendency to this disease (Gill).

(b) That the work of suicide was but half accomplished, and that, the halter breaking, he fell (from a fig tree, in one tradition) across the road, and was mangled and crushed by the carts and wagons that passed over him. This explanation appears, with strange and horrible exaggerations, in the narrative of Papias, quoted by OEcumenius on Acts 1, and in Theophylact. on Matthew 27. It is, however, but a reasonable supposition that (Judas being perhaps a corpulent man), the rope breaking or slipping, he fell (probably from some elevated place, see Hackett, *Illustra. of Script.* p. 266) with such violence that his abdomen burst with the fall.

(3) That for this reason, and not because the priests had bought it with the price of blood, the field was called Aceldama. But it may readily be supposed that the potter's field which the priests had bought was the same as that in which the traitor met so terrible a death. *SEE ACELDAMA.*

VII. On the question of Judas's final salvation, it is difficult to see how any dispute could well arise in view of his self murder (comp. ^{<618B>}1 John 3:15). But aside from this, two statements seem to mark his fate in the other world as distinctly a reprobate one.

(1.) His unmitigated remorse, as expressed in ^{<427B>}Matthew 27:5. This passage has often been appealed to as illustrating the difference between μεταμελεία and μετανοία. It is questionable, however, how far the N. Test. writers recognize that distinction (compare Grotius, ad loc.). Still more questionable is the notion that Matthew describes his disappointment at a result so different from that which he had reckoned on. Yet this is nevertheless clearly an instance of "the sorrow of the world that worketh death" (^{<4070>}2 Corinthians 7:10). *SEE REPENTANCE.*

(2.) His "going to his own place" (^{<4025>}Acts 1:25), where the words ἴδιος τόπος convey to our minds, probably were meant to convey to those who heard them the impression of some dark region in Gehenna. Lightfoot and Gill (ad loc.) quote passages from Rabbinical writers who find that meaning in the phrase, even in ^{<0315>}Genesis 31:55, and ^{<0225>}Numbers 24:25. On the other hand, it should be remembered that many interpreters reject that explanation (compare Meyer, ad loc.), and that one great Anglican divine (Hammond, *Comment. on N. Test.* ad loc.) enters a distinct protest against it. Similarly Dr. Clarke (*Commentary*, ad loc.) argues against the whole of our conclusions respecting the violent death of Judas; but his reasoning, as well as that of the other critics named, is far from satisfactory.

VIII. Literature. — Special treatises on the character of Judas are the following: Zandt, *Comment. de Juda proditore* (Lips. 1769); Rau, *Anmerk. üb. d. Charakter des. Judas* (Lemgo, 1778); Schmidt, *Apologie d. Judas*, in his *Exeget. Beitr.* 1, 18; 2, 342; Lechtlen, *De culpa Judoe* (Argent. 1813); Daub, *Judas Ischarioth* (Heidelb. 1816); Schollmeyer, *Jesus und Judas* (Lüneb. 1836); Augusti, *Theol. Bibl.* 1, 497, 520; Ferenczy, *De consilio proditiōnis Judae* (Utr. 1829); Gerling, *De Juda sacroae coenae conviva* (Hal. 1744); Hebenstreit, *De Juda Iscar.* (Viteb. 1712); Philipp, *Ueb. d. Verräther Judas* (Naumb. 1754); Rütz, *D. Verrätherei d. Judas* (Haag, 1789); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1863. On his death, see Casaubon, *Exerc. antibar.* 16, p. 527; Alberti, *Observat.* p. 222; Paulus, *Comment.* 3, 506; Barbatii *Dissert. novissima Judoe Iscar. fata* (Regiom. 1665); Götze, *De suspendio Judoe* (Jen. 1661); Riser, *De morte Judoe* (Viteb. 1668); Neunhöfer, *De Juda lapsu extincto* (Chemn. 1740); Oldendorp, *De Juda in templo occiso* (Hannov. 1754). For other monographs, see Volbeding, *Index*, p. 32, 54; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 191. **SEE JESUS CHRIST.**

12. A Jew residing at Damascus in the Straight street at the time of Paul's conversion, to whose house Ananias was sent (^{<4411>}Acts 11:11). A.D. 30. "The 'Straight Street' may with little question be identified with the 'Street of Bazaars,' a long, wide thoroughfare, penetrating from the southern gate into the heart of the city, which, as in all the Syro-Greek and Syro-Roman towns, it intersects in a straight line. The so called 'House of Judas' is still shown in an open space called 'the Sheykh's Place,' a few steps out of the 'Street of Bazaars:' it contains a square room with a stone floor, partly walled off for a tomb, shown to

Maundrell (*Early Trav.* Bohn, p. 494) as the 'tomb of Ananias.' The house is an object of religious respect to Mussulmans as well as Christians (Stanley, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 412; Conybeare and Howson, 1, 102; Pococke, 2, 119)." **SEE DAMASCUS.**

13. Surnamed BARSABAS, a Christian teacher sent from Jerusalem to Antioch along with Paul and Barnabas (⁴¹⁵²Acts 15:22, 27, 32). A.D. 47. He is supposed by some (see Grotius, Wolf, ad loc.) to have been one of the seventy disciples, and brother of Joseph, also surnamed Barsabas (son of Sabas), who was proposed, with Matthias, to fill up the place of the traitor Judas (⁴⁰²³Acts 1:23); but others (Augusti, *Uebers. d. Kathol. Br.* 2, 86) identify him with Judas Thaddeus (but see Bertholdt, 5, 2681). Schott supposes that Barsabas means the son of Sabas, or Zabas, which he fancifully regards as an abridged form for Zebedee, and concludes that the Judas here mentioned was a brother of the elder James and of John. Judas and Silas are mentioned together (in the above deputation of the Church to determine the obligation of the Mosaic law) as "prophets" and "chief men among the brethren" at the metropolis, "perhaps a member of the Presbytery" (Neander, *P. and Tr.* 1, 123). After employing their prophetic gifts for the confirmation of the Syrian Christians in the faith, Judas went back to Jerusalem, while Silas either remained at Antioch (for the reading ⁴¹⁵³Acts 15:34 is uncertain; and while some MSS., followed by the Vulgate, add μόνος Ἰούδαςδὲ ἐπορεύθη, the best omit the verse altogether) or speedily returned thither. **SEE PAUL.**

14. Son of one Jairus, and leader of a company of Jews during the final siege of Jerusalem by the Romans, from which he escaped by an underground passage; he was afterwards slain while leading the defense of the castle of Machaerus against the Roman troops (Josephus, *War*, 7, 6, 5).

Judas Light, Or Judas Of The Paschal,

was the name of a wooden imitation of the candle which held the real paschal in the seventh branch standing upright, the rest diverging on either side. See Walcott; *Sac. Archoeol.* s.v.

Judd, Gaylord,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Watertown, Conn., Oct. 7, 1784, and converted in 1805. He was licensed as a local preacher in 1809, and thus labored faithfully for twelve years; entered the Genesee

Conference in 1821; was superannuated in 1841; and died at Candor, Tioga Co., N.Y., in 1859. He was a sound and evangelical preacher, and "had a good report of all men." Many souls were converted by his ministry, and his memory is precious in the Susquehanna Valley, the principal field of his labors. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1859, 7, 162.

Judd, Sylvester,

a Unitarian minister of some note, was born in Westhampton, Mass., July 23, 1813, and was educated at Yale College. He was of Orthodox parentage, but shortly after the completion of his collegiate studies he changed his religious opinions, and went to Cambridge Divinity School to prepare for ministerial duties in the Unitarian Church. He was called to Augusta, Maine, and there spent his life. He died in 1853, "at the very beginning of a course of high usefulness, of a life which seemed essential to the Church." Judd wrote several books having a moral end in view, and as a literary character enjoyed a good reputation for ability. See *Life and Character of the Rev. S. Judd* (Bost. 1854), p. 531; *Christian Examiner*, 1855, p. 63 sq.

Judd, Willard,

a Baptist minister, was born in Southington, Conn., Feb. 23, 1804. After teaching for a short time, he settled in Canaan, N.Y., and was licensed to preach in 1826. He then removed to Herkimer Co., and preached alternately in Salisbury and Oppenheim until Aug. 23, 1828, when he united with the Church in Salisbury. He continued his labors here with great success until 1835, when his health compelled him to abandon the ministry. In 1839 he accepted an appointment as classical teacher in Middlebury Academy, at Wyoming, which situation he held until his death in Feb. 1840. Mr. Judd published *A Review of Professor Stuart's Work on Baptism* (1836, and later revised and enlarged). A collection of several of his miscellaneous papers, with a brief Memoir of his life, was published after his death. — Sprague, *Annals*, 6, 750.

Jude,

or, rather, JUDAS (Ἰούδας, i.q. JUDAH; *SEE JUDA*). There were two of this name among the twelve apostles — Judas, called also LEBBAEUS and THADDAEUS (~~ⲓⲟⲩⲁⲥ~~ Matthew 10:4; ~~ⲓⲟⲩⲁⲥ~~ Mark 3:18), and Judas Iscariot. Judas is likewise the name of one of our Lord's brethren (~~ⲓⲟⲩⲁⲥ~~ Matthew 13:55;

^{<100B>}Mark 6:3), but it is not agreed whether our Lord's brother is the same with the apostle of this name. Luke (Gospel, 6:16; Acts. 1:13) calls him **Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου**, which in the English Auth. Vers. is translated "Judas, the brother of James." This is defended by Winer (*Gramm. of N.T. Dict.*), Arnaud (*Recher. Crit. sur l' Ep. de Jude*), and accepted by Burton, Alford, Tregelles, Michaelis, etc. The ellipsis, however, between **Ἰούδας** and **Ἰακώβου** is supplied by the old Syriac translator (who was unacquainted with the Epistle of Jude, the writer of which calls himself **Ἰούδας ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου**, ^{<100B>}Jude, verse 1), with the word *son*, and not *brother*. Among our Lord's brethren are named (along with Judas) James and Joses (^{<100B>}Matthew 13:55; ^{<100B>}Mark 6:3). If, with Helvidius among the ancients (see Jerome, *Contra Helvidium*), and Kuinöl, Neander, and a few other modern commentators, we were to consider our Lord's brethren to be children of Joseph and the Virgin Mary, we should be under the necessity of supposing that there was a James, a Joses, and a Judas who were uterine brothers of our Lord, together with the apostles James and Judas, who were children of Mary, the sister or cousin of the Virgin (see Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. 4). Otherwise it remains for us to choose the opinion that our Lord's brethren were children of Joseph by a former wife (Escha or Salome, according to an apocryphal tradition), which was the sentiment of the majority of the fathers (still received in the Oriental Church), or the opinion adopted in the Western Church, and first broached by Jerome (*Cont. Helvid.*), that the brethren of our Lord were his cousins, as being children of Mary, the wife of Cleophas, who must therefore be considered as the same with Alphaeus. If we consider James, the brother of our Lord, to be a different person from James, the son of Alphseus, and not one of the Twelve, Jude, the brother of James, must consequently be placed in the same category; but, if they are one and the same, Jude must be considered as the person who is numbered with our Lord's apostles. The most plausible solution of the whole difficulty is by means of the following hypotheses: Alphoeus, otherwise called Clopas, was the brother of Joseph, the reputed father of Christ, and married Mary (not necessarily a blood relative of the Virgin); dying without issue, he left his wife, thenceforth designated as Mary, the wife (i.e. widow) of Clopas, to his brother Joseph, who had by her several children, namely; James, Judas, Simon, and Joses (and perhaps others, including sisters), the eldest of whom (James) was especially. designated as the son of Alphaeus, as being his heir. (^{<100B>}Deuteronomy 25:5). The first two of these (being probably older than Jesus) were the James and Judas, or Jude, mentioned among the apostles,

as also the authors of the epistles bearing their respective names, being half brothers of Christ, as the reputed son of the common parent Joseph. *SEE ALPHEUS; SEE JAMES; SEE JOSEPH; MARY.*

We are not informed as to the time of the vocation of the apostle Jude to that dignity. Indeed, the only circumstance relating to him which is recorded in the Gospels consists in the question put by him to our Lord (~~4142~~ John 14:22): "Judas saith unto him (not Iscariot), Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to us, and not unto the world?" Nor have we any account given of his proceedings after our Lord's resurrection, for the traditionary notices which have been preserved of him rest on no very certain foundation (Lardner's *History of the Apostles*). There may be some truth in the tradition which connects him with the foundation of the church at Edessa; though here again there is much confusion, and doubt is thrown over the account by its connection with the worthless fiction of "Abgarus, king of Edessa" (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 13; Jerome, *Comm. in Matthew* 10). Nicephorus (*Hist. Eccl.* 2, 40) makes Jude die a natural death in that city after preaching in Palestine, Syria, and Arabia. The Syrian tradition speaks of his abode at Edessa, but adds that he went thence to Assyria, and was martyred in Phoenicia on his return; while that of the West makes Persia the field of his labors and the scene of his martyrdom. Jude the apostle is commemorated in the Western Church, together with the apostle Simon (the name, also, of one of our Lord's brethren), on the 8th of October. Eusebius gives us an interesting tradition of Hegesippus (*Hist. Eccl.* 3, 20, 32) that two grandsons of Jude, "who, according to the flesh, was called the Lord's brother" (comp. ~~4195~~ 1 Corinthians 9:5), were seized and carried to Rome by order of Domitian, whose apprehensions had been excited by what he had heard of the mighty power of the kingdom of Christ; but that the emperor having discovered by their answers to his inquiries, and the appearance of their hands, that they were poor men, supporting themselves by their labor, and having learned the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, dismissed them in contempt, and ceased from his persecution of the Church, whereupon they returned to Palestine, and took a leading place in the churches, "as being at the same time confessors and of the Lord's family" (ὡς ἂν δὴ μάρτυρας ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γένους ὄντας τοῦ Κυρίου), and lived till the time of Trajan. Nicephorus (1, 23) tells us that Jude's wife was named Mary. For further discussion, see Bertholdt, Einl. 5, 2679; 6, 31, 79; Perionii *Vitoe Apostol.* p. 166; Assemani. *Biblioth. Orient.* 3, 2, 13; 1, 302, 611; Bayer, *Hist. Osrhoen. et*

Edessen. p. 104; Credner, *Einl.* 1, 611; De Wette, *Einl. ins N.T.* 1). 340; Harenberg, in *Miscell. Lips. nov.* 3, 373; Michaelis, *Einl.* 2, 1489; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 32. On the pretended Gospel of Thaddaeus, see Kleuker, *Apokr. N.T.* p. 67 sq. **SEE LEBBAEUS.**

Jude, Epistle Of.

The last in order of the catholic epistles.

I. Author. — The writer of this epistle styles himself, verse 1, "Jude, the brother of James" (ἄδελφὸς Ἰακώβου), and has usually been identified with the apostle Judas Lebbaeus or Thaddeus, called by Luke (^{<4166>}Luke 6:16) ἄδελφὸς Ἰακώβου, A.V. "Judas, the brother of James." It has been seen above that this mode of supplying the ellipsis, though not altogether 'in accordance with the *usus loquendi*, is, nevertheless, quite justifiable, although there are strong reasons for rendering the words "Judas, the son of James." Jerome, Tertullian, and Origen among the ancients, and Calmet, Calvin, Hammond, Hänlein, Lange, Vatablus, Arnaud, and Tregelles among the moderns, agree in assigning the epistle to the apostle. Whether it were the work of an apostle or not, it has from very early times been attributed to "the Lord's brother" of that name (^{<4155>}Matthew 13:55; ^{<4108>}Mark 6:3): a view in which Origen, Jerome, and (if indeed the *Adumbrationes* be rightly assigned to him) Clemens Alexandrinus agree; which is implied in the words of Chrysostom (*Hom.* 48 in *Joan.*), confirmed by the epigraph of the Syriac versions, and is accepted by most modern commentators — Arnaud, Bengel, Burton, Hug, Jessien, Olshausen, Tregelles, etc. The objection that has been felt by Neander (*P1. and Tr.* 1, 392) and others, that if he had been "the Lord's brother" he would have directly styled himself so, and not merely "the brother of James," has been anticipated by the author of the "*Adumbrationes* (Bunsen, *Analect. Ante-Nicoen.* 1, 330), who says, "Jude, who wrote the catholic Epistle, brother of the sons of Joseph, an extremely religious man, though he was aware of his relationship to the Lord, did not call himself his brother; but what said he? 'Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ' as his Lord, but 'brother of James.'" We may easily believe that it was through humility, and a true sense of the altered relations between them and him who had been "declared to be the Son of God with power.... by the resurrection from then dead" (comp. ^{<4165>}2 Corinthians 5:16), that both Jude and James forbore to call themselves the brethren of Jesus. The arguments concerning the authorship of the epistle are ably summed up by Jessien (*De Authent.*

Ep. Jud. Lips. 1821.) and Arnaud (*Recher. Critiq. sur l'Epist. de Jude*, Strasb. 1851, transl. in the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July 1869); and, though it is by no means clear of difficulty, the most probable conclusion is that the author was Jude, one of the brethren of Jesus, and brother of James, as also the apostle, the son of Alphaeus. **SEE BRETHERN OF OUR LORD.**

II. Genuineness and Canonicity. — Although the Epistle of Jude is one of the so called *Antilegomena*, and its canonicity was questioned in the earliest ages of the Church, there never was any doubt of its genuineness among those by whom it was known. It was too unimportant to be a forgery; few portions of holy Scripture could, with reverence be it spoken, have been more easily spared; and the question was never whether it was the work of an impostor, but whether its author was of sufficient weight to warrant its admission into the canon. This question was gradually decided in its favor, and the more widely it was known the more generally it was received as canonical, until it took its place without further dispute as a portion of the volume of holy Scripture. **SEE ANTILEGOMENA.**

This epistle is not cited by any of the apostolic fathers; the passages which have been adduced as containing allusions to it (*Hermas, Past. Vis.* 4, 3; *Clem. Rom., Ep. ad Corinthians* ch. 11; *Polycarp, Ep. ad Phil.* ch. 3) presenting no certain evidence of being such. It is, however, formally quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Poedag.* 3, 239, ed. Sylburg.; *Strom.* 3, 431), and Eusebius testifies (*Hist. Eccles.* 6, 14) that he treated it in his *Hypotyposes*; it is also treated in the *Adumbrationes*, ascribed to Clement, and preserved in a Latin version. Tertullian refers to the epistle as that of Jude the apostle (*De Habit. Mulieb.* ch. 3). It appears in the Muratori Fragment among the canonical books. Origen repeatedly refers to it, and occasionally as the work of the apostle Jude (*Hom. in Matt.* 13:55, in *Opp.*, ed. De la Rue, 3, 403; *Com. in Ep. ad Rom.*, in *Opp.* 4, 519; *Hom. in Jos.*, in *Opp.* 2, 411; *De Princip.*, in *Opp.* 1, 138, etc.); though in one place he speaks as if doubts were entertained by some as to its genuineness (*in Matt.* 22:23, in *Opp.* 3, 814). It is not in the Peshito, and does not appear to have been known to the Syrian churches before the 4th century, near the close of which it is quoted by Ephraem Syrus (*Opp. Syr.* 1, 136). Eusebius ranks it among the *Antilegomena*, but this rather because it was not universally known than because where known it was by any regarded with suspicion (*Hist. Eccles.* 2, 23; 3, 25). By Jerome it is referred to as the work of an apostle (*in Tit.* 1; *Ep. ad Paulin.* 3), and he states that, though suspected by some, in consequence of containing a quotation from

the apocryphal book of Enoch, it had obtained such authority as to be reckoned part of the canonical Scriptures (*Catal. Script. Eccles.*). From the 4th century onwards, the place thus conceded to it remained unquestioned (Westcott, *Canon of the N. Test.*). Thus the epistle is quoted by Malchian, a presbyter of Antioch, in a letter to the bishops of Alexandria and Rome (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 7, 30), and by Palladius, the friend of Chrysostom (Chrysostom, *Opp.* 13, *Dial.* cc, 18, 20), and is contained in the Laodicene (A.D. 363), Carthaginian (397), and so called Apostolic catalogues, as well as in those emanating from the churches of the East and West, with the exception of the Synopsis of Chrysostom, and those of Cassiodorus and Ebed Jesu.

Various reasons might be assigned for delay in receiving this epistle, and the doubts long prevalent respecting it. The uncertainty as to its author, and his standing in the Church; the unimportant nature of its contents, and their almost absolute identity with ~~3 Peter~~ 2 Peter 2; and the supposed quotation of apocryphal books, would all tend to create a prejudice against it, which could only be overcome by time, and the gradual recognition by the leading churches of its genuineness and canonicity.

At the Reformation the doubts on the canonical authority on this epistle were revived, and have been shared in by modern commentators. They were more or less entertained by Grotius, Luther, Calvin, Bergen, Bolten, Dahl, Michaelis, and the Magdeburg Centuriators. It has been ably defended by Jessien, *De Authentia Ep. Judoe*, Lips. 1821.

There is nothing, however, in the epistle itself to cast suspicion on its genuineness; on the contrary, it rather impresses one with the conviction that it must have proceeded from the writer whose name it bears. Another, forging a work in his name, would hardly have omitted to make prominent the personality of Judas, and his relation to our Lord, neither of which comes before us in this epistle (Bleek, *Einl. in. d. N. Test.* p. 557). **SEE CANON.**

III. Time and Place of Writing. — There are few, if any, external grounds for deciding these points, and the internal evidence is but small.

1. The question of date is connected by many with that of its relation to ~~3 Peter~~ 2 Peter (see below), and an earlier or later period has been assigned to it according as it has been considered to have been anterior or posterior to that epistle. Attempts have also been made to prove a late date for the

epistle, from an alleged quotation in it from the apocryphal book of Enoch (verse 13); but it is by no means certain that the passage is a quotation from the now extant book of Enoch, and scholars have yet to settle when the book of Enoch was written; so that from this nothing can be inferred as to the date of this epistle.

From the character of the errors against which it is directed, however, it cannot be placed very early; though I there is no sufficient ground for Schleiermacher's opinion that "in the last time" (ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ, ver. 18; comp. ^{καπίδ}1 John 2:18, ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ) forbids our placing it in the apostolic age at all. Lardner places it between A.D. 64 and 66, Davidson before A.D. 70, Credner A.D. 80, Calmet, Estius, Witsius, and Neander, after the death of all the apostles but John, and perhaps after the fall of Jerusalem; although considerable weight is to be given to the argument of De Wette (*Einleit. in N.T. p. 300*), that if the destruction of Jerusalem had already taken place, some warning would have been drawn from so signal an instance of God's vengeance on the "ungodly." From the allusion, however to the preaching of the apostles, we may infer that it was among the later productions of the apostolic age; for it was written while persons were still alive who had heard apostles preach, but when this preaching was beginning to become a thing of the past (ver. 17). On the other hand, again, if the author were really the brother of Jesus, especially an elder brother, we cannot well suppose him to have lived much beyond the middle of the first century. We may therefore conjecturally place it about A.D. 66.

2. There are still less data from which to determine the place of writing. Burton, however, is of opinion that inasmuch as the descendants of "Judas, the brother of the Lord," if we identify him with the author of the epistle, were found in Palestine, he probably "did not absent himself long from his native country," and that the epistle was published there, since he styles himself "the brother of James," an expression most likely to be used in a country where James was well known" (*Eccles. Hist. 1, 334*). With this locality will agree all the above considerations as to date.

IV. *Persons to whom the Epistle is addressed.* — These are described by the writer as the called who are sanctified in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ." From the resemblance of some parts of this epistle to the second of Peter, it has been inferred that it was sent to the same parties in Asia Minor, and with a view to enforcing the apostle's admonitions; while others, from the strongly Jewish character of the writing, infer that it was

addressed to somebody of Jewish Christians in Palestine. From the fact that the parties addressed seem to have been surrounded by a large and wicked population, some have supposed that they may have dwelt in Corinth, while others suggest one of the commercial cities of Syria. The supposition that the parties addressed dwelt in Egypt is mere conjecture. But the address (ver. 1) is applicable to Christians generally, and there is nothing in the body of the epistle to limit its reference and though it is not improbable that the author had a particular portion of the Church in view, and that the Christians of Palestine were the immediate objects of his warning, the dangers described were such as the whole Christian world was exposed to, and the adversaries the same which had everywhere to be guarded against.

V. *Object, Contents, and Errors inveighed against.* — The purpose which the writer had in view is stated by himself. After the inscription, he says that, intending to write "of the common salvation," he found himself, as it were, compelled to utter a solemn warning in defense of the faith, imperiled by the evil conduct of corrupt men (ver. 3). Possibly there was some observed outbreak which gave the occasion. The evil for a while had been working in secret — "certain men crept in unawares" (ver. 4) — but now the canker showed itself. The crisis must be met promptly and resolutely. Therefore the writer denounces those who turned the grace of God "into lasciviousness," virtually denying God by disobeying his law. He alarms by holding out three examples of such sin and its punishment — the Israelites that sinned in the wilderness; the angels that "kept not their first estate;" and the foul cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (ver. 5-7). He next describes minutely the character of those whom he censures, and shows how of old they had been prophetically marked out as objects of deserved vengeance (ver. 8-16). Then, turning to the faithful, he reminds them that the apostles had forewarned them that evil men would rise in the Church (ver. 17-19); exhorts them to maintain their own steadfastness (ver. 20, 21), and to do their utmost in rescuing others from contamination (ver. 22, 23); and concludes with an ascription of praise to him who alone could keep his people from falling (ver. 24, 25). The whole was thoroughly applicable to a time when iniquity was abounding, and the love of many waxing cold (^{4B42}Matthew 24:12)..

The design of such a train of thought is obviously to put the believers to whom the epistle was addressed on their guard against the misleading efforts of certain persons to whose influence they were exposed. Who these persons were, or to what class of errorists they belonged, can only be

matter of conjecture. Some, indeed (De Wette, Schwegler, Bleek), think the persons alluded to held no peculiar opinions, and were simply men of lax morals; but, from the manner in which the writer refers to them, it is evident that they were, to use the words of Dorner (*Entwicklungsgesch.* 1, 104, E.T. 1, 72), "not merely practically corrupt, but teachers of error as well." Their opinions seem to have been of an antinomian character (vers. 4, 18, 19), but there is nothing to connect them, except in a very vague and distant way, with any of the later gnostic systems. The writer formally charges them with "denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ," language which De Wette admits usually applies to error of doctrine, but which here he, without any reason, would understand of feeling and conduct. The licentious courses in which they indulged led Clement of Alexandria to think that they were the prototypes of the Carpocratians and such like: "Of these, and such as these," he says, "I think that Jude spoke prophetically in his epistle" (Strom. 3, 431, Sylb.); but this does not imply that they had formed a system like that of the Carpocratians, but only that the notions and usages of the one adumbrated those of the other. Perhaps there have been in all ages persons who have sought by perverted doctrine to gain a sanction for sensual indulgence. and such undoubtedly were found disturbing the peace and corrupting the purity of the churches of Christ in different places as early as the second half of the 1st century. The persons against whom Jude writes, were apparently of this class, but in their immorality the practical element was more prominent than the speculative.

VI. Style. — The main body of the epistle is well characterized by Alford (*Gk. Test.* 4, 147) as an impassioned invective, in the impetuous whirlwind of which the writer is harried along, collecting example after example of divine vengeance on the ungodly; heaping epithet upon epithet, and piling image upon image, and, as it were laboring for words and images strong enough to depict the polluted character of the licentious apostates against whom he is warning the Church; returning again and again to the subject, as though all language was insufficient to give an adequate idea of their profligacy, and to express his burning hatred of their perversion of the doctrines of the Gospel.

The epistle is said by De Wette (*Einleit. ins. N.T.* p. 300) to be tolerably good Greek, though there are some peculiarities of diction which have led Schmid (*Einleit.* 1, 314) and Bertholdt (6, 3194) to imagine an Aramaic original.

VII. *Relation between the Epistle of Jude and 2 Peter.* — The larger portion of this epistle (ver. 3-16) closely resembles in language and subject a part of the second Epistle of Peter (^{<601>}2 Peter 2:1-19). In both the heretical enemies of the Gospel are described in terms so similar as to preclude all idea of entire independence. Jude's known habit of quotation would seem to render the supposition most probable that he has borrowed from Peter. Dr. Davidson, however (*Introd. to the N. Test.* 3, 607), maintains the priority of Jude. As Jude's Epistle apparently emanated from Palestine, and (if the above date be correct) from Jerusalem, it may in some sort be regarded as an echo of Peter's admonitions uttered not long before at the Roman capital. This question will be more fully examined under *SEE PETER, SECOND EPISTLE OF.*

VIII. *Apocryphal Quotations.* — This epistle presents one peculiarity, which, as we learn from Jerome, caused its authority to be impugned in very early times — the supposed citation of apocryphal writings (ver. 9, 14, 15);

1. The former of these passages, containing the reference to the contest of the archangel Michael and the devil "about the body of Moses," was supposed by Origen to have been founded on a Jewish work called the "Assumption of Moses" (*Ἀνάληψις Μωσέως*), quoted also by OEcumenius (2, 629). Origen's words are express, "Which little work the apostle Jude has made mention of in his epistle" (*De Princip.* 2, 2; vol. 1, p. 138); and some have sought to identify the book with the *hvm trjfbæ* "The Demise of Moses," which is, however, proved by Michaelis (4, 382) to be a modern composition. Attempts have also been made by Lardner, Macknight, Vtringa, and others, to interpret the passage in a mystical sense, by reference to ^{<301>}Zechariah 3:1, 2; but the similarity is too distant to afford any weight to the idea. There is, on the whole, little question that the writer is here making use of a Jewish tradition, based on ^{<5916>}Deuteronomy 34:6, just as facts unrecorded in Scripture are referred to by Paul (^{<518>}2 Timothy 3:8; ^{<489>}Galatians 3:19), by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (^{<301>}Hebrews 2:2; 11:24); by James (^{<517>}James 5:17), and Stephen (^{<472>}Acts 7:22, 23, 30). (See further, Zirkel, *De Mosis ad Superos translatio*, Wirceb. 1798.) *SEE MOSES, ASSUMPTION OF.*

2. As regards the supposed quotation from the book of Enoch, the question is not so clear whether Jude is making a citation from a work already in the hands of his readers — which is the opinion of Jerome (1.c.)

and Tertullian (who was, in consequence, inclined to receive the book of Enoch as canonical Scripture), and has been held by many modern critics — or is employing a traditionary prophecy not at that time committed to writing (a theory which the words used, "Enoch prophesied, *saying*," ἐπροφητευσεν... Ἐνώχ λέγων, seem rather to favor), but afterwards embodied in the apocryphal work already named. This is maintained by Tregelles (Horne's *Introd.* 10th edit., 4, 621), and has been held by Cave, Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, 1, 420), Lightfoot (2, 117), Witsius, and Calvin (comp. Jerome, *Comm. in Jph.* c. 5, p. 647, 8; in *Tit.* c. 1, p. 708). The present book of Enoch actually contains (ch. 2 of *The Book of Enoch*, in Aethiopic and English, by Dr. Laurence, 3d ed. Lond. 1838) the very words cited by Jude; but some modern critics maintain that they were inserted in that book out of Jude's epistle. **SEE ENOCH, BOOK OF.**

But why should not an inspired author appropriate a piece of an apocryphal writing? If it contained elements of truth, or was simply apposite to his purpose, why should he not use it? He does not (as some allege) attribute to it any inspired authority, nor ever vouch for its accuracy. It is never objected in derogation of the apostle Paul that, both in speech and writing, he cited heathen authors, sometimes with a special reference (~~417B~~ Acts 17:28; ~~455B~~ 1 Corinthians 15:33; ~~416B~~ Galatians 5:23; ~~501D~~ Titus 1:12). It has also been asserted that in various parts of the New Testament there are allusions (if not formal citations) to several of the books commonly called apocryphal, and to other Jewish productions (see Gough's *N. Test. Quotations*, p. 276-296). Common proverbs, we know, have been introduced into Scripture (~~024B~~ 1 Samuel 24:13; ~~602D~~ 2 Peter 2:22, where the former part only of the proverb cited is from the Old Testament).

But there is no decisive proof that Jude could have seen the so called book of Enoch. For, though this has been ascribed in part to the Maccabean times, and is said to have assumed its present shape prior to our Lord's advent (see Westcott, *Introduct.* p. 93, note), yet this is a theory on which critics are by no means agreed. One of the latest who has investigated the question, Prof. Volkmar, of Zurich (*Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, 1860), maintains that it was composed by one of the disciples of Rabbi Akiba, in the time of the sedition of Barchochebas, about A.D. 132. Dr. Alford is convinced by Volkmar's arguments, and infers hence that "the book of Enoch was not only of Jewish, but of distinctly antichristian origin" (*Proleg. to Jude*, p. 196). We are authorized, then, in believing that Jude merely incorporated into his epistle the tradition of Enoch's prophecy,

which was afterwards embodied in the book as we now have it. *SEE TRADITION.*

IX. Commentaries. — Special exegetical helps on the whole Epistle of Jude exclusively are the following, of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Didymus Alexandrinus, *In Ep. Judoe* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 5; and *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, 6); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 5); Luther, *Auslegung* (Wittenb. 1524, 4to and 8vo; etc.); Maffe, *Explanatio* (Ven. 1576, 8vo); Ridley, *Exposition* (Lond. n. d. 16mo); De Bree, *Enarratio* (Sagunt. 1582; 4to); Radeus, *In Judoe ep.* (Antw. 1584, Gen. 1599, 8vo); Danaeus, *Commentarius* [includ. Ep. John] (Geneva, 1585, 8vo); Feuardent, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1595, 8vo); Junius, *Notoe* (Lugd. Bat. 1599, 8vo; also in *Opp.* 1, 1654); Willet, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1603, Cambr. 1614, fol.; also *Catholicon*, in "*Harmonie*," etc.); Turnbull, *Sermons* (London, 1606, 4to); Lancelott, *Exegesis* (Antw. 1613, 1626, 8vo); Boulduc, *Commentaria* (Paris, 1620, 4to); Pareus, *Commentarius*. (Francof. 1626, 4to); Rost, *Commentarius* (Rostock, 1627, 4to); Stumpf, *Explicatio* (Coburg; 1627, 8vo);. Otes, *Sermons* (London, 1633, 4to); Gerhard, *Adnotationes* (Jen. 1641, 1660, 1665, 4to); Du Bois, *Explicatio* (Paris, 1644, 8vo); Jenkyn, *Exposition* (Lond. 1652-54, 2 pts. in 1 vol. 4to; Glasgow, 1783; Lond. 1839, 8vo); Calovius, *Explicatio* (Vitemb. 1654, 1719, 4to) Manton, *Lectures* (London, 1658, 4to); Broughton, *Exposition* (Lond. 1662, fol.; also in *Works*, p. 402); Wandalin, *Prodromus* (Hafniae, 1663, 4to); Rappolt, *Observationes* (Lipsiae, 1675, 4to); Grelot. *Commentarius* (L.B. 1676, 4to); Verryn, *Commentarius* (L. Bat. 1677, 4to); Visscher, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1681, 4to; also in German, Bremen, 1744, 4to); Titelmann [Schenck], *Commentarius* (Marp. 1693, 8vo); Antonio, *Verklaaring* [includ. 1 Peter] (Leoward. 1693, 1697, 4to; also in German, Brem. 1700, fol.); Martin, *Commentarius* (Lipsiae, 1694, 1727, 4to); Fecht, *Expositio* (Rost. 1696, 4to); Nemeth, *Explicatio* (1700, 4to); Dorsche, *Commentarius* (fragment. in Gerhard's *Commentatio*. Francf. et Lips. 1700 4to) Perkins, *Exposition* (in *Works*, Cambridge, 1701, etc. 3, 479); Szattmar, *Explicatio* (Franec. 1702, 4to); Witsius. *Commentarius* (L.B. 1703, 4to; also in *Meletemata*, p. 323); Feustking, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Quade, *In Epistolam et vitam Judoe* (Gryph. 1709, 4to); Creyghton, *Ontleeding*. (Haarlem, 1719, 4to); Weiss, *Commentatio* (Helmstadt, 1723, 4to); Walther, *Exegesis* (Guelpherb. 1724, 4to); Buckner, *Erklärung* (Erfurt, 1727, 4to); Reimmann, *Entsiegelung* (Brunsw. 1731, 4to); Van Seelen, *Judas antifanaticus* (Lub. 1732, 4to);

Semler, *Commentatio* [on var. read.] (Hal. 1747, 1784, 4to); Schmidt, *Observationes* (Lipsiae, 1768, 4to); Herder, *Briefe zweener Brüder Jesu* (Lemgo, 1775, 8vo); Pomarius, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1784, 8vo); Hasse, *Erläuterung* (Jen. 1786, 8vo); Hartmann, *Commentatio* (Cothen, 1793, 4to); Kahler, *Anmerkungen* (Rint. 1798, 8vo); *Hanlein, *Commentarius* (Erlangen, 1799, 1801, 1804, 8vo); Harenberg, *Expositio* (in *Miscell. Lips. nov.* 3, 379 sq.); Elias, *Dissertatio* (Ultraj. 1803, 8vo); Dahl, *De ἀὐθεντίᾳ*, etc. [including 2 Peter] (Rost. 1807, 8vo); Laurmann, *Notoe* (Gron. 1818, 8vo); *Jessien, *Commentatio*. [introductory] (Lipsiae, 1820, 8vo); Muir, *Discourses* (Glasg. 1822, 8vo); *Arnaud, *Sur l'authenticite*, etc. (Strasb. 1835, 8vo); Scharling, *Commentarius* [includ. Jaines] (Havn. 1841, 8vo); Brun, *Introduction* (in French, Strasb. 1842, 8vo); Bickersteth, *Exposition* (London, 1846, 12mo); Macgillivray, *Lectures* (Lond. 1846, 8vo); *Stier, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1850, 8vo); *Rampf, *Betrachtung* (Salzburg, 1854, 8vo); Gardiner, *Commentary* (Boston, 1856, 12mo); Ritschl, *Antinomisten*, etc. (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 103 sq.); Schott, *Erläuterung* (Erlang. 1863, 8vo). *SEE EPISTLES, CATHOLIC.*

Judex, Matthaeus,

a German theologian, and one of the principal writers of the *Centuries of Magdeburg* (q.v.), was born at Dippoldsforest, in Saxony, September 22, 1528. He was educated at Wittenberg University, where he took his master's degree in Oct. 1549. Shortly after he became minister of the church of St. Ulric, at Magdeburg, and left this position in 1559 to become professor of divinity at the University at Jena; but only eighteen months later he was ousted from the chair by order of the duke of Saxony, on account of his opposition to the Synergists, who were in great favor at court. As a cause for his removal the authorities assigned his publication of *De fuga Papatus*. He then removed to Magdeburg, but, like the other authors of the *Centuries*, he had to endure persecution. He was finally obliged to quit Magdeburg, and spent the remainder of his life at Wismar. He died May 15, 1564. See Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s.v.

Judge

(*ῥῆν*, *shophet'*, usu. in the plur. *ῥῆν*, *shophetim'*, rulers rather than magistrates, from *ῥῆν*; different from, *ῥῆν* *try a cause*, see Gesenius, s.v.; compare Bertholdt's *Theolog. Journ.* 7, 1; Werner, in Rudelbach's *Zeitschr.* 1844, 3, 17; Sept., N. Test. ^{<4130>} Acts 13:20, and Josephus, *Ant.* 6,

5, 4, κριταί; in ^{<ZOR>}Daniel 3:2, 3, a diff. Chald. term is employed, ἄρχαί Gr(δία) *adargazerin'*, *chief judges*: in two passages, ^{<QZK>}Exodus 21:6; 22:8, the Hebrew magistrates are called, יהודים, *elohim'*, *gods*, compare ^{<RSK>}Psalm 82:1, 6; ^{<GKB>}John 10:34; but see Gesenius, s.v.). Besides being the general title of any magistrate, this name is applied to those persons who at intervals presided over the affairs of the Israelites during the four and a half centuries which elapsed from the death of Joshua to the accession of Saul, as recounted in the book of Judges, and as alluded to by the apostle Paul in ^{<HFD>}Acts 13:2. These judges were fifteen in number:

1. Othniel;
2. Ehud;
3. Shamgar;
4. Deborah and Barak;
5. Gideon;
6. Abimelech;
7. Tola;
8. Jair;
9. Jephthah;
10. Ibzan;
11. Elon;
12. Abdon;
13. Samson;
14. Eli;
15. Samuel.

For an account of the events of each judgeship, see the judges in their alphabetical place; for a discussion of the length of the entire period, and the adjustment of the different epochs, *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. The history appears to coincide with a time of mutual collision between the surrounding nations. *SEE JUDGES, BOOK OF*.

I. Earliest Forms and Characteristics of the Magisterial Office among the Hebrews. — The administration of justice in all early Eastern nations, as among the Arabs of the desert to this day, rests with the patriarchal seniors, the judges being the heads of tribes, or of chief houses in a tribe. (The expression βατὺ βεαυαῖα ^{<QZS4>}Numbers 25:14, is remarkable, and seems to mean the patriarchal senior of a subdivision of the tribe: comp. ^{<RBS>}1 Chronicles 4:38; ^{<QRB>}Judges 5:3, 15). Such, from their elevated

position, would have the requisite leisure, would be able to make their decisions respected, and through the wider intercourse of superior station would decide with fuller experience and riper reflection. Thus, in the book of Job (29:7, 8, 9), the patriarchal magnate is represented as going forth "to the gate" amid the respectful silence of elders, princes, and nobles (compare 32:9). The actual chiefs of individual tribes are mentioned on various occasions, one as late as the time of David, as preserving importance in the commonwealth (^{<04702>}Numbers 7:2, 10, 11; 17:6, or 17 in Heb. text; 34:18; ^{<06214>}Joshua 22:14; so perh. ^{<04612>}Numbers 16:2; 21:18). Whether the princes of the tribes mentioned in ^{<03716>}1 Chronicles 27:16; 28:1, are patriarchal heads, or merely chief men appointed by the king to govern, is not strictly certain; but it would be foreign to all ancient Eastern analogy to suppose that they forfeited the judicial prerogative before they were overshadowed by the monarchy, and in David's time this is contrary to the tenor of history. During the oppression of Egypt the nascent people would necessarily have few questions at law to plead, and the Egyptian magistrate would take cognizance of theft, violence, and other matters of police. Yet the question put to Moses shows that "a prince" and "a judge" were connected even then in the popular idea (^{<01214>}Exodus 2:14; compare ^{<04613>}Numbers 16:13). When the people emerged from this oppression into national existence, the want of a machinery of judicature began to press. The patriarchal seniors did not instantly assume the function, having probably been depressed by bondage till rendered unfit for it, not having become experienced in such matters, nor having secured the confidence of their tribesmen. Perhaps for these reasons Moses at first took the whole burden of judicature upon himself, then at the suggestion of Jethro (^{<01214>}Exodus 18:14-24) instituted judges over numerically graduated sections of the people. These were chosen for their moral fitness, but from ^{<06015>}Deuteronomy 1:15, 16, we may infer that they were taken from among those to whom primogeniture would have assigned it. Save in offenses of public magnitude, criminal cases do not appear to have been distinguished from civil. The duty of teaching the people the knowledge of the law which pertained to the Levites, doubtless included such instruction as would assist the judgment of those who were thus to decide according to it. The Levites were thus the ultimate sources of ordinary jurisprudence, and perhaps the "teaching" aforesaid may merely mean expounding the law as applicable to difficult cases arising in practice. Beyond this it is not possible to indicate any division of the provinces of deciding on points of law as distinct from points of fact. The judges mentioned as standing before

Joshua in the great assemblies of the people must be understood as the successors of those chosen by Moses, and had doubtless been elected with Joshua's sanction from among the same general class of patriarchal seniors (^{<1812>}Joshua 4:2, 4; 22:14; 24:1).

The judge was reckoned a sacred person, and secured even from verbal injuries. Seeking a decision at law is called "inquiring of God" (^{<12185>}Exodus 18:15). The term "gods" is actually applied to judges (^{<1216>}Exodus 21:6; compare ^{<1811>}Psalms 82:1, 6). The judge was told, "Thou shalt not be afraid of the face of men, for the judgment is God's;" and thus, while human instrumentality was indispensable, the source of justice was upheld as divine, and the purity of its administration only sank with the decline of religious feeling. In this spirit speaks Psalm 82 — a lofty charge addressed to all who judge; compare the qualities regarded as essential at the institution of the office (^{<12121>}Exodus 18:21), and the strict admonition of ^{<16168>}Deuteronomy 16:18-20. But besides the sacred dignity thus given to the only royal function, which, under the theocracy, lay in human hands, it was made popular by being vested in those who led public feeling, and its importance in the public eye appears from such passages as ^{<18112>}Psalms 69:12 (comp. 119:23); 82; 148, 11; ^{<11815>}Proverbs 8:15; 21:4, 5, 23. There could have been no considerable need for the legal studies and expositions of the Levites during the wanderings in the wilderness, while Moses was alive to solve all questions, and while the law which they were to expound was not wholly delivered. The Levites, too, had a charge of cattle to look after in that wilderness like the rest, and seem to have acted also, being Moses' own tribe, as supports to his executive authority. But then few of the greater entanglements of property could arise before the people were settled in their possession of Canaan. Thus they were disciplined in smaller matters, and under Moses' own eye, for greater ones. When, however, the commandment, "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates" (^{<16168>}Deuteronomy 16:18), came to be fulfilled in Canaan, there were the following sources from which those officials might be supplied: 1st, the *ex-officio* judges, or their successors, as chosen by Moses; 2dly, any surplus left of patriarchal seniors when these were taken out (as has been shown from ^{<18115>}Deuteronomy 1:15, 16) from that class; and, 3dly, the Levites. On what principle the non-Levitical judges were chosen after divine superintendence was interrupted at Joshua's death is not clear. A simple way, would have been for the existing judges in every town, etc., to choose their own colleagues, as vacancies fell, from among the limited number of

persons who, being heads of families, were competent. Generally speaking, the reputation for superior wealth, as some guarantee against facilities for corruption, would determine the choice of a judge, and, taken in connection with personal qualities, would tend to limit the choice to probably a very few persons in practice. The supposition that judicature will always be provided for is carried through all the books of the Law (see ^{<0206>}Exodus 21:6; 22; ^{<0195>}Leviticus 19:15; ^{<0354>}Numbers 35:24; ^{<0116>}Deuteronomy 1:16; 16:18; 25:1). All that we know of the facts of later history confirms the supposition. The Hebrews were sensitive as regards the administration of justice; nor is the free spirit of their early commonwealth in anything more manifest than in the resentment which followed the venal or partial judge. The fact that justice reposed on a popular basis of administration largely contributed to keep up this spirit of independence, which is the ultimate check on all perversions of the tribunal. The popular aristocracy (if we may so term it) of heads of tribes, sections of tribes, or families, is found to fall into two main orders of varying nomenclature, and rose from the *capite censi*, or mere citizens, upward. The more, common name for the higher order is "princes," and for the lower, "elders" (^{<0784>}Judges 8:14; ^{<0124>}Exodus 2:14; ^{<0307>}Job 29:7, 8, 9; ^{<0508>}Ezra 10:8). These orders were the popular element of judicature. On the other hand, the Levitical body was imbued with a keen sense of allegiance to God as the Author of Law, and to the Covenant as his embodiment of it, and soon gained whatever forensic experience and erudition those simple times could yield; hence they brought to the judicial task the legal acumen and sense of general principles which complemented the ruder lay element. Thus the Hebrews really enjoyed much of the virtue of a system which allots separate provinces to judge and jury, although we cannot trace any such line of separation in their functions, save in so far as has been indicated above. To return to the first or popular branch; there is reason to think, from the second concurrence of phraseology amid much diversity, that in every city these two ranks of "princes" and "elders" had their analogies, and that a variable number of heads of families and groups of families, in two ranks, were popularly recognized, whether with or without any form of election, as charged with the duty of administering justice. Succoth (^{<0784>}Judges 8:14) may be taken as an example. Evidently the *ex-officio* judges of Moses' choice would have left their successors when the tribe of Gad, to which Succoth pertained (^{<0137>}Joshua 13:27), settled in its territory and towns: and what would be more simple than that the whole number of judges in that tribe should be allotted to its towns in

proportion to their size? As such judges were mostly the head men by genealogy, they would fall into their natural places, and symmetry would be preserved. The Levites also were apportioned, on the whole, equally among the tribes; and if they preserved their limits, there were probably few parts of Palestine beyond a day's journey from a Levitical city.

One great hold which the priesthood had, in their jurisdiction, upon men's ordinary life was the custody in the sanctuary of the standard weights and measures, to which, in cases of dispute, reference was doubtless made. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that in most towns sufficiently exact models of them for all ordinary questions would be kept, since to refer to the sanctuary at Shiloh, Jerusalem, etc., in every case of dispute between dealers would be nugatory (^{<02013>}Exodus 30:13; ^{<01847>}Numbers 3:47 ^{<3612>}Ezekiel 45:12). Above all these, the high priest in the ante-regal period was the resort in difficult cases (^{<01712>}Deuteronomy 17:12), as the chief jurist of the nation, and one who would, in case of need, be perhaps oracularly directed; yet we hear of none acting as judge save Eli, nor is any judicial act recorded of him though perhaps his not restraining his sons is meant to be noticed as a failure in his, judicial duties. Now the judicial authority of any such supreme tribunal must have wholly lapsed at the time of the events recorded in Judges 19. It should not be forgotten that in some cases of "blood" the "congregation" themselves were to "judge" (^{<08524>}Numbers 35:24), and that the appeal of ^{<02014>}Judges 20:4-7 was thus in the regular course of constitutional law. It is also a fact of some weight, negatively, that none of the special deliverers called judges was of priestly lineage, or even became as much noted as Deborah, a woman. This seems to show that any central action of the high priest on national unity was null, and of this supremacy, had it existed in force, the judicial prerogative was the main element. Difficult cases would include cases of appeal, and we may presume that, save so far as the authority of those special deliverers made itself felt, there was no judge in the last resort from Joshua to Samuel. Indeed, the current phrase of those deliverers that they "judged" Israel during their term, shows which branch of their authority was most in request, and the demand of the people for a king was, in the first instance, that he might "judge them," rather than that he might "fight their battles" (^{<01815>}1 Samuel 8:5, 20).

II. Peculiar Traits and Functions of the "Judges" in the Period designated by their Rule. — The station and office of these *shopetim* are involved in great obscurity, partly from the want of clear intimations in the

history in which their exploits and government are recorded, and partly from the absence of parallels in the history of other nations by which our notions might be assisted. The offices filled by Moses and Joshua, whose presence was so essential for the time and the occasion, were not at all involved in the general machinery of the Hebrew government. They were specially appointed for particular services, for the performance of which they were invested with extraordinary powers; but when their mission was accomplished, society reverted to its permanent institutions and its established forms of government. As above seen, every tribe had its own hereditary chief or "prince," who presided over its affairs, administered justice in all ordinary cases, and led the troops in time of war. His station resembled that of the Arabian emirs, or rather, perhaps, of the khans of the Tartar tribes inhabiting Persia and the countries further east. He was assisted in these important duties by the subordinate officers, the chiefs of families, who formed his council in such matters of policy as affected their particular district, supported his decisions in civil or criminal inquiries, and commanded under him in the field of battle (Numbers 26; 27; ~~Joshua~~ Joshua 7:16-18). This was, in fact, the old patriarchal government, to which the Hebrews were greatly attached. It was an institution suited to the wants of men who live dispersed in loosely connected tribes, and not to the wants and exigencies of a nation. It was in principle segregative, not aggregative and although there are traces of united agreement through a congress of delegates, or rather of national chiefs and elders of the tribes, this was an inefficient instrument of general government, seeing that it was only applicable or applied to great occasions, and could have no bearing on the numerous questions of an administrative nature which arise from day to day in every state, and which there should somewhere exist the power to arrange and determine. This defect of the general government it was one of the objects of the theocratical institutions to remedy. Jehovah had taken upon himself the function of king of the chosen people, and he dwelt among them in his palace tabernacle. Here he was always ready, through his priest, to counsel them in matters of general interest, as well as in those having reference only to particular tribes; and to his court they were all required by the law to repair three times every year. Here, then, was the principle of a general administration, calculated and designed to unite the tribes into a nation by giving them a common government in all the higher and more general branches of administration, and a common center of interest for all the political and ecclesiastical relations of the community. It was on this footing that the law destined the government of the Hebrews to

proceed, after the peculiar functions of the legislator and the conqueror had been fulfilled. *SEE THEOCRACY.*

The fact is, however, that, through the perversity of the people, this settlement of the general government on theocratical principles was not carried out in its proper form and extent. and it is in this neglect we are to seek the necessity for those officers called judges who were from time to time raised up to correct some of the evils which resulted from it. It is very evident from the whole history of the judges that, after the death of Joshua, the Israelites threw themselves back upon the segregative principles of their government by tribes, and all but utterly neglected and for a long period did utterly neglect, the rules and usages on which the general government was established. There was, in fact, no human power adequate to enforce them. They were good in themselves, they were gracious, they conferred high privileges, but they were enforced by no sufficient authority. No one was amenable to any tribunal for neglecting the annual feasts, or for not referring the direction of public affairs to the divine King.

Omissions on these points involved the absence of the divine protection and blessing, and were left to be punished by their consequences. The man who obeyed in this and other things was blessed; the man who did not was not blessed; and general obedience was rewarded with national blessing, and general disobedience with national punishment. The enormities and transgressions into which the people fell in consequence of such neglect, which left them an easy prey to idolatrous influences, are fully recorded in the Book of Judges. The people could not grasp the idea of a divine and invisible king; they could not bring themselves to recur to him in all those cases in which the judgment of a human king would have determined the course of action, or in which his arm would have worked for their deliverance. Therefore it was that God allowed them judges — in the persons of faithful men, who acted for the most part as agents of the divine will — regents of the invisible King, and who, holding their commission directly from him or with his sanction, would be more inclined to act as dependent vassals of Jehovah than kings, who, as members of royal dynasties, would come to reign with notions of independent rights and royal privileges; which would draw away their attention from their true place in the theocracy. In this greater dependence of the judges upon the divine King we see the secret of their institution. The Israelites were disposed to rest upon their separate interests as tribes, and, having thus allowed the standing general government to remain inoperative through

disuse, they would, in case of emergency, have been disposed "to make themselves a king like the nations" had their attention not been directed to the appointment of officers whose authority. could rest on no tangible *right* apart from character and services, which, with the temporary nature of their power, rendered their functions more accordant with the principles of the theocracy than those of any other public officers could be. It is probably in this adaptation to the peculiar circumstances of the Hebrew theocracy that we shall discover the reason of our inability to find any similar office among other nations. In being thus peculiar it resembled the dictatorship among the Romans, to which office, indeed, that of the judges has been compared, and perhaps this parallel is the nearest that can be found. But there is this great difference. that the dictator laid down his power as soon as the crisis which had called for its exercise had passed away, and in no case could this unwonted supremacy be retained beyond a limited time (Livy, 9, 34); but the Hebrew judge remained invested with his high authority the whole period of his life, and is therefore usually described by the sacred historian as presiding to the end of his days over the tribes of Israel, amid the peace and security which his military skill and counsels had, under the divine blessing, restored to the land.

It is usual to consider the judges as commencing their career with military exploits to deliver Israel from foreign oppression, but this is by no means invariably the case. Eli and Samuel were not military men, Deborah judged Israel before she planned the war against Jabin; and of Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, it is at least uncertain whether they ever held any military command. In many cases it is true that military achievements were — the means by which they elevated themselves to the rank of judges; but in general the appointment may be said to have varied with the exigencies of the times, and with the particular circumstances which in times of trouble would draw the public attention to persons who appeared suited by their gifts and influence to advise in matters of general concernment, to decide in questions arising between tribe and tribe, to administer public affairs, and to appear as their recognized head in their intercourse with their neighbors and oppressors. As we find that many of these judges arose *during* times of oppression, it seems to us that this last circumstance, which has never been taken into account, must have had a remarkable influence in the appointment of the judge. Foreigners could not be expected to enter into the peculiarities of the Hebrew constitution, and would expect to receive the proposals, remonstrances, or complaints of the people through some

person representing the whole nation, or that part of it to which their intercourse applied. The law provided no such officer except in the high priest; but as the Hebrews themselves did not recognize the true operation of their theocracy, much less were strangers likely to do so. On the officer they appointed to represent the body of the people, under circumstances which compelled them to deal with foreigners mightier than themselves, would naturally devolve the command of the army in war, and the administration of justice in peace. This last was among ancient nations, and it is still in the East, regarded as the first and most important duty of a ruler, and the interference of the judges was probably confined to the cases arising between different tribes, for which the ordinary magistrates would find it difficult to secure due authority to their decisions.

In nearly all the instances recorded the appointment seems to have been by the free, unsolicited choice of the people. The election of Jephthah, who was nominated as the fittest man for the existing emergency, probably resembled that which was usually followed on such occasions; and probably, as in his case, the judge; in accepting the office, took care to make such stipulations as he deemed necessary. The only cases of direct divine appointment are those of Gideon and Samson, and the last stood in the peculiar position of having been from before his birth ordained "to begin to deliver: Israel." Deborah was called to deliver Israel, but was already a judge. Samuel was called by the Lord to be a prophet, but not a judge, which ensued from the high gifts which the people recognized as dwelling in him; and as to Eli, the office of judge seems to have devolved naturally, or, rather, *ex-officio*, upon him; and his case seems to be the only one in which the high priest appears in the character which the theocratical institutions designed for him.

The following clear summary of their duties and privileges is from Jahn (*Bibl. Archäol.* 2, 1, § 22 sq.; *Heb. Commonwealth*, Stowe's transl., § 23): "The office of judges or regents was held during life, but it was not hereditary, neither could they appoint their successors. Their authority was limited by the law alone; and in doubtful cases they were directed to consult the divine King through the priest by Urim and Thummim (⁽⁴²⁷⁾Numbers 27:21). They were not obliged in common cases to ask advice of the ordinary rulers; it was sufficient if these did not remonstrate against the measures of the judge. In important emergencies, however, they convoked a general assembly of the rulers, over which they presided and exercised a powerful influence. They could issue orders, but not enact

laws; they could neither levy taxes nor appoint officers, except perhaps in the army. Their authority extended only over those tribes by whom they had been elected or acknowledged; for it is clear that several of the judges presided over separate tribes. There was no income attached to their office, nor was there any income appropriated to them, unless it might be a larger share in the spoils, and those presents which were, made them as testimonials of respect (^{<0782>}Judges 8:24). They bore no external marks of dignity, and maintained no retinue of courtiers, though some of them were very opulent. They were not only simple in their manners, moderate in their desires, and free from avarice and ambition. but noble and magnanimous men, who felt that whatever they did for their country was above all reward, and could not be recompensed; who desired merely to promote the public good, and who chose rather to deserve well of their country than to be enriched by its wealth. This exalted patriotism, like everything else connected with politics in the theocratical state of the Hebrews; was partly of a religious character, and these regents always conducted themselves as the officers of God; in all their enterprises they relied upon him, and their only care was that their countrymen should acknowledge the authority of Jehovah, their invisible king (^{<0782>}Judges 8:22 sq.; compare ^{<810>}Hebrews 11). Still they were not without faults, neither are they so represented by their historians; they relate, on the contrary, with the utmost frankness, the great sins of which some of them were guilty. They were not merely deliverers of the state from a foreign yoke, but destroyers of idolatry, foes of pagan vices, promoters of the knowledge of God, of religion, and of morality; restorers of theocracy in the minds of the Hebrews, and powerful instruments of divine Providence in the promotion of the great design of preserving the Hebrew constitution, and by that means of rescuing the true religion from destruction.... By comparing the periods during which the Hebrews were oppressed by their enemies with those in which they were independent and governed by their own constitution, it is apparent that the nation in general experienced much more prosperity than adversity in the time of the judges. Their dominion continued four hundred and fifty years; but the whole time of foreign oppression amounts only to one hundred and eleven years, scarcely a fourth part of that period. Even during these one hundred and eleven years the whole nation was seldom under the yoke at the same time, but, for the most part, separate tribes only were held in servitude; nor were their oppressions always very severe; and all the calamities terminated in the advantage and glory of the people as soon as they abolished idolatry and returned to their king, Jehovah. Neither was the

nation in such a state of anarchy at this time as has generally been supposed. There were regular judicial tribunals at which justice could be obtained, and when there was no supreme regent, the public welfare was provided for by the ordinary rulers" (^{<0801>}Ruth 4:1-11; ^{<0702>}Judges 8:22; 10:17, 18; 11:1-11; ^{<0901>}1 Samuel 4:1; 7:1, 2).

See generally Buddei *Hist. V.T.* 1, 939 sq.; Zeltner, *De adolescentia reip. Israel.* (Altorf, 1696); Bauer, *Heb. Gesch.* 2, 34 sq.; Hess, *Gesch. Josua's u. d. Heerführer* (Zur. 1779), 2; Paulus, *Theol.-exeget. Conservator.* 2, 180 sq.; Döring, *Das Zeitalter der Richter* (Freiburg, 1833); Ewald. *Isr. Gesch.* 2, 362 sq.; Stanley, *Hist. of Jewish Church*, lect. 13.

III. *The Judicial Office in later Periods among the Hebrews.* — The magisterial functions of the priesthood being, it may be presumed, in abeyance during the period of the judges, seem to have merged in the monarchy. The kingdom of Saul suffered too severely from external foes to allow civil matters much prominence. Hence of his only two recorded judicial acts, the one (^{<0911>}1 Samuel 11:13) was the mere remission of a penalty. popularly demanded; the other the pronouncing of a sentence (^{<0944>}1 Samuel 14:44, 45), which, if it was sincerely intended, was overruled in turn by the right sense of the people. In David's reign it was evidently the rule for the king to hear causes in person, and not merely be passively, or even by deputy (though this. might also be included), the "fountain of justice" to his people. For this purpose, perhaps, it was prospectively ordained that the king should "write him a copy of the law," and "read therein all the days of his life" (^{<0571>}Deuteronomy 17:18, 19). The same class of cases which were reserved for Moses would probably fall to his lot, and the high priest. was, of course, ready to assist the monarch. This is further presumable from the fact that no officer analogous to a chief justice ever appears under the kings. It has been supposed that the subjection of all Israel to David's sway caused an influx of such cases, and that advantage was artfully taken of this by Absalom (^{<0151>}2 Samuel 15:1-4); but the rate at which cases were disposed of can hardly have been slower among the ten tribes after David had become their king, than it was during the previous anarchy. It is more probable that during David's uniformly successful wars wealth and population increased rapidly, and civil cases multiplied faster than the king, occupied with war, could attend to them, especially when the summary process customary in the East is considered. Perhaps the arrangements mentioned in ^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 23:4; 26:29. (compare 5:32, "rulers" probably including judges), of the 6000 Levites

acting as "officers and judges," and amongst them specially "Chenaniah and his sons," with others, for the trans-Jordanic tribes, may have been made to meet the need of suitors. In Solomon's character, whose reign of peace would surely be fertile in civil questions, the "wisdom to judge" was the fitting first quality (^{<1039>}1 Kings 3:9; comp. ^{<972>}Psalm 72:1-4). As a judge Solomon shines "in all his glory" (^{<1036>}1 Kings 3:16, etc.). No criminal was too powerful for his justice, as some had been for his father's (^{<1033>}2 Samuel 3:39, ^{<1025>}1 Kings 2:5, 6, 33, 34). The examples of direct royal exercise of judicial authority are 2:Samuel 1:15; 4:9-12, where sentence is summarily executed, and the supposed case of ^{<1040>}2 Samuel 14:1-21. The denunciation of ^{<1025>}2 Samuel 12:5, 6, though not formally judicial, is yet in the same spirit. Solomon similarly proceeded in the cases of Joab and Shimei (^{<1023>}1 Kings 2:34, 46; compare ^{<1245>}2 Kings 14:5, 6). It is likely that royalty in Israel was ultimately unfavorable to the local independence connected with the judicature of the "princes" and "elders" in the territory and cities of each tribe. The tendency of the monarchy was doubtless to centralize, and we read of large numbers of king's officers appointed to this and cognate duties (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 23:4; 26:29-32). If the general machinery of justice had been, as is reasonable to think, deranged or retarded during a period of anarchy, the Levites afforded the fittest materials for its reconstitution. Being to some extent detached, both locally, and by special duties, exemptions, etc., from the mass of the population, they were, more easily brought to the steady routine which justice requires, and, what is no less important, were, in case of neglect of duty, more at the mercy of the king (as shown in the case of the priests at Nob, ^{<1027>}1 Samuel 22:17). Hence it is probable that the Levites generally superseded the local elders in the administration of justice. But subsequently, when the Levites withdrew from the kingdom of the ten tribes, judicial elders probably again filled the gap. Thus they conducted the mock trial of Naboth (^{<1208>}1 Kings 21:8-13). There is in ^{<1495>}2 Chronicles 19:5, etc., a special notice of a reappointment of judges by Jehoshaphat, and of a distinct court, of appeal, perhaps, at Jerusalem, composed of Levitical and of lay elements. In the same place (as; also in a previous one, ^{<1332>}1 Chronicles 26:32) occurs a mention of "the king's matters" as a branch of jurisprudence. The rights of the prerogative having a constant tendency to encroach, and needing continual regulation, these may have grown probably into a department somewhat like the English Exchequer.

One more change is noticeable in the pre-Babylonian period. The "princes" constantly appear as a powerful political body, increasing in influence and privileges, and having a fixed center of action at Jerusalem, till, in the reign of Zedekiah, they seem to exercise some of the duties of a privy council, and especially a collective jurisdiction. (^{<482>}2 Chronicles 28:21; ^{<380>}Jeremiah 26:10, 16). These "princes" are probably the heads of great houses in Judah and Benjamin, whose fathers had once been the pillars of local jurisdiction, but who, through the attractions of a court, and probably also under the constant alarm of hostile invasion, became gradually residents in the capital, and formed an oligarchy which drew to itself, amidst the growing weakness of the latter monarchy, whatever vigor was left in the state, and encroached on the sovereign attribute of justice. The employment in offices of trust and emolument would tend also in the same way, and such chief families would probably monopolize such employment. Hence the constant burden of the prophetic strain, denouncing the neglect, the perversion, the corruption of judicial functionaries (^{<2017>}Isaiah 1:17, 21; 5:7; 10:2; 28:7; 56:1; 59:4; ^{<3118>}Jeremiah 2:8; 5:1; 7:5; 21:12; ^{<3227>}Ezekiel 22:27; 45:8, 9; ^{<3850>}Hosea 5:10; 7:5, 7; ^{<3185>}Amos 5:7, 15, 24; 6:12; ^{<3004>}Habakkuk 1:4, etc.). Still, although far changed from its broad and simple basis in the earlier periods the administration of justice had little resembling the set and rigid system of the Sanhedrim of later times. This last change arose from the fact that the patriarchal seniority, degenerate and corrupted as it became before the, captivity, was by that event broken up, and anew basis of judicature had to be sought for. *SEE SANHEDRIM.*

4. Judicial Customs. — With regard to the forms of procedure, little more is known than may be gathered from the two examples, ^{<891>}Ruth 4:2, of a civil, and ^{<1208>}1 Kings 21:8-14, of a criminal character; to which, as a specimen of royal summary jurisdiction, may be added the well known "judgment" of Solomon. Boaz apparently empanels, as it were, the first ten "elders" whom he meets "in the gate," the well known site of the Oriental court, and cites the other party by "Ho, such a one;" and the people appear to be invoked as attesting the legality of the proceeding. The whole affair bears an extemporaneous aspect, which may, however, be merely the result of the terseness of the narrative. In ^{<809>}Job 9:19, we have a wish expressed that a "time to plead" might be "set" (comp. the phrase of Roman law, *diem dicere*). In the case of the involuntary homicide seeking the city of refuge, he was to make out his case to the satisfaction of its elders (^{<810>}Joshua 20:4), and this failing, or the congregation deciding against his

claim to sanctuary there (though how its sense was to be taken does not appear), he was not put to death by act of public justice, but left to the "avenger of blood" (^{<1592>}Deuteronomy 19:12). The expressions between "blood and blood;" between "plea and plea" (^{<1578>}Deuteronomy 17:8), indicate a presumption of legal intricacy arising, the latter expression seeming to imply something like what we call a "cross suit." We may infer from the scantiness, or, rather, almost entire absence of direction as regards forms of procedure, that the legislator was content to leave them to be provided for as the necessity for them arose, it being impossible by any jurisprudential devices to anticipate chicane. It is an interesting question how far judges were allowed to receive fees of suitors; Michaelis reasonably presumes that none were allowed or customary, and it seems, from the words of ^{<9128>}1 Samuel 12:3, that such transactions would have been regarded as corrupt. There is another question how far advocates were usual. There is no reason to think that, until the period of Greek influence, when we meet with words based on *συνήγορος* and *παράκλητος*, any professed class of pleaders existed. Yet passages abound in which the pleading of the cause of those who are unable to plead their own is spoken of as, what it indeed was, a noble act of charity; and the expression has even (which shows the popularity of the practice) become a basis of figurative allusion (^{<1862>}Job 16:21; ^{<1223>}Proverbs 22:23; 23:11; 31:9; ^{<2017>}Isaiah 1:17; ^{<2403>}Jeremiah 30:13; 1:34; 51:36). The blessedness of such acts is forcibly dwelt upon, ^{<1822>}Job 29:12, 13.

There is no mention of any distinctive dress or badge as pertaining to the judicial officer. A staff or scepter was the common badge of a ruler or prince, and this they probably bore (^{<2345>}Isaiah 14:5; Amos 1:5, 8). They would, doubtless, be more than usually careful to comply with the regulations about dress laid down in ^{<0153>}Numbers 15:38, 39; ^{<1522>}Deuteronomy 22:12. The use of the "white asses" (^{<0050>}Judges 5:10) by those who "sit in judgment" was perhaps a convenient distinctive mark for them when journeying where they would not usually be personally known.

For other matters relating to some of the processes of law, *SEE OATH*; *SEE OFFICER*; *SEE TRIAL*; *SEE WITNESS*, etc.

Judges, Book Of,

the third in the list of the historical compositions of the O.T. (counting the Pentateuch as one), or the seventh of the separate books. Its close

connection with the book of Joshua is an important element in the controversial criticism of both.

I. Title and Order. — In the original Hebrew, as well as in all the translations, this book bears the name of Judges (μυφῶν, Sept. **Κριταί**, Vulgate *liber Judicum*), and this name has obviously been given to it because chiefly relating the transactions connected with the deliverance and government of Israel by the men who bear this title in the Hebrew polity. The period of history contained in this book, however, reaches from Joshua to Eli, and is thus more extensive than the time of the judges. A considerable portion of it also makes no mention of them, though belonging to their time. The Book of Ruth was originally a part of this book, but about the middle of the 5th century after Christ it was placed in the Hebrew copies immediately after the Song of Solomon. In the Sept. it has preserved its original position, but as a separate book. The chronological relation of these books corresponds with the order in which they are arranged, namely, after the Book of Joshua. See below, § 6.

II. Contents. — The book may most properly be divided into three parts, the middle one of which alone is in strictly chronological order.

1. The Introduction (Judges 1-3:6), containing preliminary information on certain points requisite to be known, or else general statements which give a key to the course of the history properly so called, and to the writer's mode of presenting it. The first chapter is chiefly geographical, containing a statement of what the several tribes had done or failed to do the second chapter, together with the opening verses of the third, are predominantly moral and reflective; or, otherwise the first gives the political relations of Israel to the Canaanites, and the second gives the religious relation of Israel to the Lord. This part may therefore be subdivided into two sections, as follows:

a. Judges 1-2:5, which may be considered as a first introduction, giving a summary of the results of the war carried on against the Canaanites by the several tribes on the west of Jordan after Joshua's death, and forming a continuation of ^{<622>}Joshua 12. It is placed first, as in the most natural position. It tells us that the people did not obey the command to expel the people of the land, and contains the reproof of them by a prophet.

b. ^{<622>}Judges 2:6-3:6. This is a second introduction, standing in nearer relation to the following history. It informs us that the people fell into

idolatry after the death of Joshua and his generation, and that they were punished for it by being unable to drive out the remnant of the inhabitants of the land, and by falling under the hand of oppressors. A parenthesis occurs (^{<0721>}Judges 2:16-19) of the highest importance, as giving a key to the following portion. It is a summary view of the history: the people fall into idolatry; they are then oppressed by a foreign power; upon their repentance they are delivered by a judge, after whose death they relapse into idolatry..

2. Body of the History (^{<0707>}Judges 3:7-chap. 16). The words "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord," which had already been used in ^{<0721>}Judges 2:11, are employed to introduce the history of the thirteen judges comprised in this book. An account of six of these thirteen is given at greater or less length. The account of the remaining seven is very short, and merely attached to the longer narratives. These narratives are as follows:

(1) The deliverance of Israel by Othniel, Judges 3L7-11.

(2) The history of Ehud and (in 31) that of Shamgar, ^{<0712>}Judges 3:12-31.

(3) The deliverance by Deborah and Barak, ch. 4-5.

(4) The whole passage in 6-10:5. The history of Gideon and his son Abimelech is contained in chap. 1-9, and followed by the notice of Tola (^{<0710>}Judges 10:1, 2) and Jair (^{<0710>}Judges 10:3, 5). This is the only case in which the history of a judge is continued by that of his children. But the exception is one which illustrates the lesson taught by the whole book. Gideon's sin in making the ephod is punished by the destruction of his family by Abimelech, with the help of the men of Shechem, who, in their turn, become the instruments of each other's punishment. In addition to this, the short reign of Abimelech would seem to be recorded as being an unauthorized anticipation of the kingly government of later times.

(5) ^{<0716>}Judges 10:6-ch. 12. The history of Jephthah (10:6-12:7), to which is added the mention of Ibzan (12, 8-10), Elon (11, 12), Abdon (13-15).

(6) The history of Samson, consisting of twelve exploits, and forming three groups connected with his love of three Philistine women, ^{<0720>}Judges 13-16. We may observe in general on this portion of the book that it is almost entirely a history of the wars of deliverance: there are no sacerdotal allusions in it; the tribe of Judah is not alluded to after the time of Othniel;

and the greater part of the judges belong to the northern half of the kingdom.

A closer inspection, however, discloses a more interior, and therefore truer arrangement of this, the main part of the book, and one better calculated to bring out the theocratic government of God, which, as we have seen in the preceding article; was the cardinal idea of the office known as that of "the Judges." Moses had been commissioned by *the Angel of the Covenant*, who went before the people in all their marches (~~ORR~~ Exodus 3:1-6; 13:21; 14:19, etc.), and to fit him for his office Moses was filled with *the Spirit of the Lord*, which was given to him in a measure apparently not given to any mere man after him. But the Spirit; which was communicated in a certain degree to men for various tasks in connection with the Church and people, was especially communicated from Moses, in whom the fullness resided (fullness such as was possible under the Old Testament dispensation), to the seventy elders who assisted him in the administration, and to Joshua, who was called to be his successor (~~ORR~~ Numbers 11:17, 25; 27:16, 18, 20). Agreeably to this the true grouping of the events in the time of the judges must be looked for in connection with the *coming forth of the Angel of the Covenant*, and the *corresponding mission of the Spirit of the Lord* into the hearts of his instruments. (No arguing is needed to establish the erroneousness of our translation, "an angel of the Lord" [2:1; 6:11]; "an angel of God" [13:6, 9, 13]. The only possible rendering is, "the Angel of the Lord," "the Angel of God;" and this is amply confirmed by the attributes of Godhead which appear in the narratives.) Yet, while we notice these epochs of special manifestation, we must remember that God was always present with his people, at the head of their government, and working in a more ordinary manner in calling out agents for preserving and recovering the visible Church and holy nation. Besides, there was the standing method of consulting him by Urim and Thummim, through the high priest; and there was his way of extraordinarily addressing the people by prophets; of both of these there are recorded instances in this book, although the prophetic agency is rare and feeble till the time of Samuel (~~ORR~~ 1 Samuel 3:1, 19-21), with whom the succession of prophets began (~~ORR~~ Acts 3:24).

Now the appearance of the Angel of the Lord. and the mission of the Spirit in a special manner is four times noticed in the body of the history, and nowhere else, except in the poetical allusion in ~~ORR~~ Judges 5:23.

(1.) The Angel of Jehovah went up from Gilgal to Bochim, and reproached the people for neglecting his work of redemption; threatening to help them no more; yet in reality, by the utterance of this threat, suggesting that his free grace would help them, as in fact they immediately gained a victory over their own sinful selves (^{<0725>}Judges 2:15). The outward victory over oppressors was soon gained by Othniel (^{<0730>}Judges 3:10) when "the Spirit of the Lord came," literally was, "upon him, and he judged Israel, and went out to war."

(2.) The Angel of the Lord came and gave a mission to Gideon to deliver Israel (^{<0731>}Judges 6:11, etc.), and to fit him for it (ver. 34), "the Spirit of the Lord came upon," literally clothed, "Gideon, and he blew the trumpet."

(3.) A passage (^{<0700>}Judges 10:10-16) is so similar to the account of the Angel at Bochim that we do not know how to avoid the impression that it is the Angel himself who speaks in that immediate manner which is peculiar to this book; certainly there is no hint of any prophet in the case, and a message like this from the Urim and Thummim is nowhere on record in Scripture. The closing words that, after having refused to "save" them (not merely "deliver," as in our version) on the repentance of the people, "his soul was grieved for the misery of Israel," suggest the same interpretation, in the light of the commentary (^{<2368>}Isaiah 63:8, 9): "So he said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie; so he was their Savior. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the Angel of his Presence saved them." Upon this, Jephthah was called to lead the people; and as on the two earlier occasions (^{<0712>}Judges 11:29), "The Spirit of the Lord came," literally was, "upon Jephthah."

(4.) The Angel of the Lord appeared to the parents of Samson, announcing the birth of their son, who was to begin to "deliver," or rather "save," Israel (^{<0733>}Judges 13:3-23). This, occurs with the usual correspondence (ver. 24, 25), "The child grew, and the Lord blessed him; and the Spirit of the Lord, began to move him at times;" while of him alone, as one peculiarly chosen by the Lord and given to him from his birth, it is said repeatedly afterwards, that "the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him."

This arrangement suggests the four periods of history noted in the table given below (§ 9). The appearance of the angel of the Lord and the mission of the Spirit, however, belong not to the very commencement of the period, but rather to the continuance or close of a term of sin and disgrace.

Perhaps in Gideon and Jephthah's cases the appearance of the angel and the mission of the Spirit were almost contemporaneous; but in the first case and in the last there must have been some distance of time between them, not now ascertainable, but possibly amounting to several years, and determined in each case by the particulars of the crisis which demanded these manifestations.

3. An Appendix (^{<0770>}Judges 17-21). This part has no formal connection with the preceding, and has often, but unnecessarily, been assumed to have been added by a later hand. No mention of the judges occurs in it. It contains allusions to "the house of God," the ark, and the high priest. The period to which the narrative relates is simply marked by the expression "when there was no king in Israel" (^{<0790>}Judges 19:1; comp. 18:1). It records two series of incidents:

a. The conquest of Laish by a portion of the tribe of Dan, and the establishment there of the idolatrous worship of Jehovah already instituted by Micah in Mount Ephraim (^{<0770>}Judges 17, 18). The date of this occurrence is not marked, but it has been thought to be subsequent to the time of Deborah, as her song contains no allusion to any northern settlements of the tribe of Dan.

b. The almost total extinction of the tribe of Benjamin by the whole people of Israel, in consequence of their supporting the cause of the wicked men of Gibeah, and the means afterwards adopted for preventing its becoming complete (ch. 19-20). The date is in some degree marked by the mention of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron (^{<0718>}Judges 20:28), and by the proof of the unanimity still prevailing among the people.

III. Design. — The above analysis clearly indicates a unity of plan on the part of the writer. His leading object he distinctly intimates in ^{<0711>}Judges 2:11-23, namely, in enforcement of the central idea of the theocracy, to prove that the calamities to which the Hebrews had been exposed since the death of Joshua were owing to their apostasy from Jehovah, and to their idolatry. "They forsook the Lord, and served Baal, and Ashtaroth" (^{<0713>}Judges 2:13), for which crimes they were deservedly punished and greatly distressed (^{<0715>}Judges 2:15). Nevertheless, when they repented and obeyed again the commandments of the Lord, he delivered them out of the hand of their enemies by the *shophetim* whom he raised up, and made them prosper (^{<0716>}Judges 2:16-23). To illustrate this theme, the author collected

the most important elements of the Hebrew history during the period between Joshua and Eli. Some episodes occur, but in arguing his subject he never loses sight of his leading theme, to which, on the contrary, he frequently recurs while stating facts, and shows how it applied to them; the moral evidently being, that the only way to happiness was to shun idolatry and obey the commandments of the Lord. The appendix further illustrates the lawlessness and anarchy prevailing in Israel after Joshua's death.

Yet the words of the passage in which the author thus discloses his main object must not be pressed too closely, as if implying a perfect remedy of each political ruin. It is a general view, to which the facts of the history correspond in different degrees. Thus the people is contemplated as a whole; the judges are spoken of with the reverence due to God's instruments, and the deliverances appear complete. But it would seem that the people were in no instance under exactly the same circumstances, and the judges in some points fall short of the ideal. Thus Gideon, who in some respects is the most eminent of them, is only the head of his own tribe, and has to appease the men of Ephraim by conciliatory language in the moment of victory over the Midianites; and he himself is the means of leading away the people from the pure worship of God. In Jephthah we find the chief of the land of Gilead still affected to some extent by personal reasons (^{<0710>}Judges 11:9): his war against the Ammonites is confined to the east side of Jordan, though its issues probably also freed the western side from their presence, and it is followed by a bloody conflict with Ephraim. Again, Samson's task was simply "to *begin* to deliver Israel" (^{<0715>}Judges 13:5): and the occasions which called forth his hostility to the Philistines are of a kind which place him on a different level from Deborah or Gideon. This shows that the passage in question is a general review of the collective history of Israel during the time of the judges, the details of which, in their varying aspects, are given. faithfully as the narrative proceeds.

This view of the author's design may lead us to expect that we have not a complete history of the times a fact which is clear from the book itself. We have only accounts of parts of the nation at any one time. We may easily suppose that there were other incidents of a similar nature to those recorded in ch. 17-21. Indeed, in the history itself there are points. which are obscure from want of fuller information, e.g. the reason for the silence about the tribe of Judah (see also ^{<0718>}Judges 8:18; 9:26). Some suppose even that the number of the judges is not complete, but there is no reason for this opinion. *Bedan* (^{<0921>}1 Samuel 12:11) is probably the same *as*

Abdon. Ewald (Gesch. 2, 477) rejects the common explanation that the word is a contracted form of *Ben-Dan*, i.e. Samson. *Jael* (^{<0786>}Judges 5:6) need not be the name of an unknown judge, or a corruption of *Jair*, as Ewald thinks, but is probably the wife of Heber. "The days of Jael" would carry the misery of Israel up to the time of the victory over Sisera, and such an expression could hardly be thought too great an honor at that time (see 5:24). Had the writer designed to give a full and connected history of the Hebrews in the period between Joshua and the kings, he would doubtless have described the state of the domestic affairs and of the government in the several tribes, the relation in which they stood to each other, and the extent of power exercised by a judge, with other particulars such as do not appear in the narrative.

IV. Sources of the Materials. — Parts of the work are undoubtedly taken from ancient records and genealogies, others from traditions and oral information. From ancient authentic documents are probably copied the song of Deborah (^{<0785>}Judges 5), the beautiful parable of Jotham 9:8-15), and the beginning of Samson's epinician, or triumphal poem (^{<0756>}Judges 15:16). See also chap. 14:14, 18; 15:7. In their genealogies the Hebrews usually inserted also some historical accounts, and from this source may have been derived the narrative of the circumstances that preceded the conception of Samson, which were given as the parents related them to others (^{<0781>}Judges 42). These genealogies were sometimes further illustrated by tradition, and several incidents in the history of Samson appear to have been derived from this kind of information. But on many points tradition offered nothing, or the author rejected its information as not genuine, and unworthy of belief. Thus it is that of Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, the author gives only the number of years that they governed and the number of their children, but relates none of their transactions (^{<0700>}Judges 10:1-5; 12:8, 9, 11, 13). In some instances the very words of the ancient documents which the author used seem to have been preserved, and this proves the care with which he composed. Thus, in the first division of our book, but nowhere else, rich and powerful men are described as men riding on ass-colts (^{<0704>}Judges 10:4; 12:14, etc.); also in the song of Deborah (^{<0789>}Judges 5:9, 10). In the appendix also of this book, but nowhere else, a priest has the honorary title of father given him (^{<0770>}Judges 17:10; 18:19). But, though the author sometimes retained the words of his sources, still the whole of the composition is written in a particular style, distinguishing it from all other books of the Old Testament.

The idea of the Israelites being overcome by their enemies he expresses often in this way: "The anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he sold them into the hands of their enemies" (⁽⁰¹²⁴⁾Judges 2:14; 3:8; 4:2; 10:7). A courageous and valiant warrior is described as a person upon whom rests the spirit of Jehovah, or as a person whom the spirit of Jehovah clothed (⁽⁰¹⁶³⁾Judges 6:34; 9:29; 14:6, 19; 15:14, etc.).

Stähelin (*Krit. Untersuch.* p. 106) thinks that 3:7-16: present the same manner and diction throughout, and that there is no need to suppose written sources. So Hävernack (*Einleitung*, 1, 1, p. 68 sq., 107) only recognizes the use of documents in the appendix. Other critics, however, trace them throughout. Bertheau (*On Judges*, p. 28-32) says that the difference of the diction in the principal narratives, coupled with the fact that they are united in one plan, points to the incorporation of parts of previous histories. Thus, according to him, the author found the substance of 4:2-24 already accompanying the song of Deborah; in ch. 6-9 two distinct authorities are used a life of Gideon, and a history of Shechem and its usurper; in the account of Jephthah a history of the tribes on the east of Jordan is employed, which meets us again in different parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua; and the history of Samson is taken from a longer work on the Philistine wars. Ewald's view is similar (*Gesch.* 1, 184 sq.; 2, 486 sq.).

V. Unity. — This has already been pretty fully vindicated in the above remarks on the design of the writer (§ 3). The attacks that have been made upon the unity of the book are rested on very trifling grounds. The chief one is the existence of the appendix, though it is not difficult to see the two great reasons for this part of the book assuming such a form: the one, that the historical development according to plan was not to be interrupted; the other, that the two events which it narrates are to be looked on less as single events than as permanent influences. The permanence of the worship at Dan is expressly mentioned (⁽⁰¹⁸³⁾Judges 18:30, 31), and "the captivity of the land" for the twenty years before Samuel assumed office is traced to it with tolerable distinctness. The permanence of the moral evil which came out at Gibeah is not so plainly intimated; on the contrary, it might have been supposed to be eradicated by the vengeance taken on Benjamin. Yet the evil to be found in the whole tribes is indicated by their share in the terrible chastisement; and there is a hint of the continuance of some equally potent mischievous influence in the similar slaughter of the tribe of Ephraim by Jephthah. The prophet Hosea in so many words informs us that

the days of Gibeah never ceased in Israel, and that the root of the evil had not been taken away (^{<399>}Hosea 9:9; 10:9). There have been, indeed, some very unsuccessful efforts to establish a difference of the words in use and the style of composition in the appendix and in the body of the book, but there has been little appearance of success in the undertaking. Even these objectors have frequently admitted a resemblance and unity between the appendix and the introduction, on account of which some of them have gone so far as to say that both these may belong to a later editor, who prefixed and annexed his new materials to a previously existing work, the history of the judges strictly so called. The argument from internal chronological data will be examined below (§ 7). The attempts to discover contradictions in the book, with a view to show a plurality of authors, have also signally failed.

VI. Relation to other Books of Scripture. — This is somewhat connected with the topics discussed under the preceding and following heads. The coincidences with the two adjoining Biblical books, however, are so striking as to call for a distinct notice.

1. Relation to the Book of Joshua. — Joshua 15-21 must be compared with ^{<000>}Judges 1 in order to understand fully how far the several tribes failed in expelling the people of Canaan. Nothing is said in chap. 1 about the tribes on the east of Jordan, which had already been mentioned (^{<633>}Joshua 13:13), nor about Levi (see ^{<633>}Joshua 13:33; 21:1-42). The carrying on of the war by the tribes singly is explained by ^{<628>}Joshua 24:28. The book begins with a reference to Joshua's death, and 2:6-9 resumes the narrative, suspended by 1-2:5, with the same words as are used in concluding the history of Joshua (24:28-31). In addition to this, the following passages appear to be common to the two books: ^{<010>}Judges 1:10-15, 20, 21, 27, 29, compared with ^{<654>}Joshua 15:14-19, 13, 63; 17:12; 16:10. A reference to the conquest of Laish (^{<080>}Judges 18) occurs in ^{<697>}Joshua 19:47.

2. Relation to the Books of Samuel and Kings. — We find in ^{<002>}Judges 1:28, 30, 33, 35, a number of towns upon which, "when Israel was strong," a tribute of bond service was levied: this is supposed by some to refer to the time of Solomon (^{<103>}1 Kings 9:13-22). The conduct of Saul towards the Kenites (^{<956>}1 Samuel 15:6), and that of David (1 Samuel 30:29), is explained by 1:16. A reference to the continuance of the Philistine wars is implied in ^{<035>}Judges 13:5. The allusion to Abimelech (^{<012>}2 Samuel 11:21)

is explained by ch. 9. Chapters 17-21 and the book of Ruth are more independent, but they have a general reference to the subsequent history.

3. The question now arises whether this book forms one link in a historical series, or whether it has a closer connection either with those that precede or follow it. We cannot infer anything from the agreement of its view and spirit with those of the other books. The object of the writer was to give an account only of the "Judges" proper. Hence the history ceases with Samson, excluding Eli and Samuel; and then at this point two historical pieces are added — ch. 17-21 and the book of Ruth, supplemental to the general plan — and to each other. This is less well explained by Ewald's supposition that the books from Judges to 2 Kings form one work. In this case the histories of Eli and Samuel, so closely united between themselves, are only deferred on account of their close connection with the rise of the monarchy. Judges 17-21 is inserted both as an illustration of the sin of Israel during the time of the judges, in which respect it agrees with ch. 1-16, and as presenting a contrast with the better order prevailing in the time of the kings. Ruth follows next, as touching on the time of the judges, and containing information about David's family history which does not occur elsewhere. The connection of these books, however, is denied by De Wette (*Einleit.* § 186) and Thenius (*Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb. Samuel* p. 15, *König*, p. 1). Bertheau, on the other hand, thinks that one editor may be traced from Genesis to 2 Kings, whom he believes to be Ezra, in agreement with Jewish tradition.

VII. Authorship and Date. — The only guide to the time when the book was written is the expression "unto this day," which we frequently find in it (^{<0016>}Judges 2:6-16:), and the last occurrence of which (^{<0759>}Judges 15:19) implies some distance from the time of Samson. But ^{<0021>}Judges 1:21, according to the most natural explanation, would indicate a date, for this chapter at least, previous to the taking of Jebus by David (^{<0016>}2 Samuel 5:6-9). Again, we should at first sight suppose ^{<0028>}Judges 1:28, 30, 33, 35, to belong to the time of the judges; but these passages are taken by many modern critics as pointing to the time of Solomon (comp. ^{<0021>}1 Kings 9:21). The first portion of the book (chap. 1-16) was originally, as Ewald thinks (*Gesch.* 1, 202), the commencement of a larger work reaching down to above a century after Solomon (see also Davidson, *Introduction*, p. 649), but this is equally gratuitous. The author of the second division always describes the period of which he speaks thus: "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own

eyes" (^{<0716>}Judges 17:6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25); but this expression never once occurs in the first division. Hence many modern critics conclude that the author of the first sixteen chapters of our book was different from him who composed the appendix (see Bertholdt, *Historischkritische Einleitung in die sämmtlichen Schriften des A. und N.T.* p. 876; Eichhorn's *Einleitung in das A. Test.* 3, § 457; S. Davidson, in Horne's *Introd.*, new ed., 2, 648; but Keil the contrary, *Einleit.* p. 182). The authorship of the first sixteen chapters has been assigned to Joshua, Samuel, and Ezra. That they were not written by Joshua appears from the difference of the method of relating subjects, as well as from the difference of the style. In the book of Joshua there is a continual reference to the law of Moses, which is much less frequent in the book of Judges; and in Joshua, again, there are no such inferences from history as are common in Judges (^{<0700>}Judges 3:1, 4; 8:27; 9:56). The style of the book of Joshua is neater than that of Judges; the narration is more clear and the arrangement is better (compare ^{<0710>}Judges 1:10, 11, 20, with ^{<0646>}Joshua 14:6-15, and ^{<0753>}Judges 15:13-19; also ^{<0717>}Judges 2:7-10, with ^{<0629>}Joshua 24:29-31). That the book of Judges was composed by Samuel, although an invention of the Talmudists, unsupported by any external evidence, is nevertheless the most plausible authorship that has been assigned to it, at least so far as relates to the first division. The opinion that this portion was written by Ezra will not be entertained by any one who attentively peruses the original; for it has a phraseology of its own, and certain favorite ideas, to which it constantly reverts, but of which there is not a trace in Ezra. If Ezra had intended to continue the history of the Hebrews from Joshua down to Eli in a separate work, he would not have given a selection of incidents to prove, a particular theme, but a complete history. The orthography of the book of Ezra, with many phrases characteristic of his age, do not appear in the book of Judges. The prefix **v** occurs, indeed (^{<0700>}Judges 5:7; 6:17; 7:12; 8:26); but this cannot be referred to in proof that the language is of the time of Ezra, for it belonged to the dialect of North Palestine, as Ewald and others have proved. Other verbal peculiarities may be explained in a similar manner (see Ottmar, in Henke's *Magazin*, vol. 4; De Wette, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in die Bibel*, Berlin, 1833-39). The first sixteen chapters must have been written under Saul, whom the Israelites made their king in the hope of improving their condition. Phrases used in the period of the judges may be traced in them, and the author must consequently have lived near the time when they were yet current. He says that in his time "the Jebusites dwelt with then children of Benjamin in Jerusalem" (^{<0702>}Judges 1:21): now

this was the case only before David, who conquered the town and drove out the Jebusites. Consequently, the author of the first division of the book of Judges must have lived and written before David, and yet he was acquainted with a regal form of government, which can only point to the reign of Saul. If he had lived under David, he would have mentioned the capture of Jerusalem by that monarch, as the nature of his subject did not allow him to pass it over in silence. The omission, moreover, of the history not only of Samuel, but also of Eli, indicates an author who, living in an age very near that of Eli, considered his history as generally known, because so recent.

The exact date of the appendix is more difficult to determine, but its author certainly lived in an age considerably later than that of the recorded events. That in his time the period of the events which he relates had been long forgotten is, however, hardly a fair inference from the frequent chronological formula, "In those days there was no king in Israel" (^{<0706>}Judges 17:6); and it is gratuitous to suppose that certain particulars of his narrative could no longer be ascertained, and that this caused him to omit the name of the Levite whose history is given in ch. 19. In his time, indeed, the house of God was no longer in Shiloh (^{<0731>}Judges 18:31); and it will be recollected that it was David who brought the ark to Jerusalem. But it must be borne in mind that it had frequently changed places during the Philistine war, and it remained a long time away from Shiloh even after Eli's death. The author knew that the posterity of Jonathan were priests of the graven image in Dan, or Laish, "until the day of the captivity of the land" (^{<0730>}Judges 18:30). This latter circumstance has been assumed by Le Clerc and others to prove that the appendix was not published until after the Babylonian captivity, or at least until after that of Israel by Shalmaneser and Esar-haddon. It cannot be understood of the domination of the Philistines over the Israelites, which would very improperly be called "the captivity of the land," this expression always implying the deportation of the inhabitants of a country. But we may reasonably suppose that this expression was added by a later editor. The circumstance that the author, in mentioning Shiloh, adds, "which is in the land of Canaan" (^{<0712>}Judges 21:12), and that the topographical description of the site of Shiloh is given (^{<0719>}Judges 21:19), has led some interpreters to assert that the author of the appendix must have been a foreigner, as to an Israelite such remarks would have appeared trivial (see *Briefe einiger Hollandischen Gottesgelehrten über R. Simon's kritische Geschichte des A.T.*, edited by Le Clerc at

Zurich, p. 490). The inference is certainly specious, but, from an examination of the contexts, it appears that in the first passage Shiloh is opposed to Jabesh in Gilead, a town without the land of Canaan, and that this led the author to add to Shiloh that it was in Canaan; while the second passage describes, not the site of Shiloh, but of a place in its neighborhood, where an annual feast was celebrated, when the daughters of Shiloh came out to dance, to sing, and to play on instruments of music; the author thus heightening the interest of his narrative by giving a clearer idea of the circumstances of the festival. Neither of these passages, therefore, authorizes the inference that he was a foreigner. Under these circumstances, many have been content to conjecture that the latter portion of the book was compiled perhaps by Ezra, out of historical documents originating with the various prophetic characters that appeared from time to time during the earlier period of the Hebrew commonwealth, chiefly perhaps Samuel. But if the above reasoning is correct, especially that relating to the unity of the entire book, we do not see why Samuel himself may not have added the appendix, substantially in its present form, to the former part of the history.

VIII. *Canonicity and Credibility.* — The book was published at a time when the events related were generally known, and when the veracity of the author could be ascertained by a reference to the original documents. Several of its narratives are confirmed by the books of Samuel (comp. ^{<0701E>}Judges 4:2; 6:14; 11: with ^{<0910>}1 Samuel 12:9-12; ^{<0706>}Judges 9:53 with ^{<0121>}2 Samuel 11:21). The Psalms not only allude to the book of Judges (compare ^{<0811>}Psalms 83:11 with ^{<0725>}Judges 7:25), but copy from it entire verses (compare ^{<0808>}Psalms 58:8, 9; 97:5, with ^{<0704>}Judges 5:4, 5). Philo and Josephus knew the book, and made use of it in their own compositions. The New Testament alludes to it in several places (comp. ^{<0123>}Matthew 2:13-23 with ^{<0715>}Judges 13:5; 16:17; ^{<0413>}Acts 13:20; ^{<0812>}Hebrews 11:32).

This external evidence in support of the authority of the book of Judges is corroborated by many internal proofs of its authenticity. All its narratives are in character with the age to which they belong, and agree with the natural order of things. We find here that shortly after the death of Joshua the Hebrew nation had, by several victories, gained courage and become valorous (ch. 1 and 19), but that it afterwards turned to agriculture, preferred a quiet life, and allowed the Canaanites to reside in its territory in consideration of a tribute imposed on them, when the original plan was that they should be expelled. This changed their character entirely: they became

effeminate and indolent a result which we find in the case of all nations who, from a nomadic and warlike life, turn to agriculture. The intercourse with their heathen neighbors frequently led the uncultivated Hebrews into idolatry; and this, again, further prepared them for servitude. They were consequently overpowered and oppressed by their heathen neighbors. The first subjugation, indeed, by a king of Mesopotamia, they endured but eight years; but the second, more severe, by Eglon, lasted longer: it was the natural consequence of the public spirit having gradually more and more declined, and of Eglon having removed his residence to Jericho with a view to closely watching all their movements (Josephus, *Ant.* 5, 5). When Ehud sounded the trumpet of revolt, the whole nation no longer rose in arms, but only the inhabitants of Mount Ephraim (^{<0787>}Judges 3:27); and when Barak called to arms against Sisera, many tribes remained quietly with their herds (^{<0754>}Judges 5:14, 15, 26, 28). Of the 30,000 men who offered to follow Gideon, he could make use of no more than 300, this small number only being, as it would seem, filled with true patriotism and courage. Thus the people had sunk gradually, and deserved for forty years to bear the yoke of the Philistines, to whom they had the meanness to deliver Samson, who, however, loosed the cords with which he was tied, and killed a large number of them (^{<0750>}Judges 15). It is impossible to consider such a historical work, which perfectly agrees with the natural course of things, as a fiction: at that early period of authorship, no author could, from fancy, have depicted the character of the Hebrews so conformably with nature and established facts. All in this book breathes the spirit of the ancient world. Martial law we find in it, as could not but be expected, hard and wild. The conquered people are subjected to rough treatment, as is the case in the wars of all uncivilized people; the inhabitants of cities are destroyed wholesale (^{<0786>}Judges 8:16, 17; 20). Hospitality and the protection of strangers received as guests is considered the highest virtue: a father will rather resign his daughter than allow violence to be done to a stranger who stops in his house for the night (ch. 19; comp. ^{<0190>}Genesis 19).

In the state of oppression in which the Hebrews often found themselves during the period from Joshua to Eli; it was to be expected that men, filled with heroism; should now and then rise up and call the people to arms in order to deliver them from their enemies. Such valiant men are introduced by our author, and he extols them, indeed, highly; but, on the other hand, he is not silent respecting their faults, as may be seen in the instances of Ehud, whom he reports to have murdered a king to recover liberty for his

country (^{<07816>}Judges 3:16 sq.); of Gideon, who is recorded to have punished the inhabitants of Succoth and Penuel cruelly for having refused bread to his weary troops (^{<07816>}Judges 8:16, 17); and of Jephthah, whose inconsiderate vow deprives him of his only daughter (^{<07134>}Judges 11:34). This cannot be a fiction; it is no panegyric on Israel to describe them in the manner the author has done. Now this frank, impartial tone pervades the whole work. It begins with displaying the Israelites as a refractory and obstinate people, and the appendix ends with the statement of a crime committed by the Benjamites, which had the most disastrous consequences. At the same time, due praise is bestowed on acts of generosity and justice, and valiant feats are carefully recorded.

But are not the exploits of its heroes exaggerated in our book, like those of Sesostris, Semiramis, and Hercules? Their deeds are, no doubt, often splendid; but they do not surpass belief, provided we do not add to the narrative anything which the original text does not sanction, nor give to particular words and phrases a meaning which does not belong to them. Thus, when we read that "Shamgar *slew* of the Philistines 600 men" (3:31), it would perhaps have been correct if the Hebrew **ËYiv** had been rendered by "put to flight;" and it should further be recollected that Shamgar is not stated to have been alone and unassisted in repelling the enemy: he did it, no doubt, supported by those brave men whose leader he was. It frequently happens that to the leader is attributed what has been performed by his followers. Nor can it offend when, in the passage quoted above, it is said that Shamgar repelled the Philistines with an ox goad; for this was exactly the weapon which an uncultivated Oriental warrior, who had been brought up to husbandry, would choose in preference to other instruments of offense. From the description which travelers give of it, it appears to have been well suited to such a purpose. *SEE GOAD*. It is chiefly the prodigious strength of Samson, however, which to very many readers seems exaggerated, and surpassing all belief. He is, e.g., reported to have, unarmed, slain a lion (^{<07415>}Judges 14:5,6); to have caught 300 jackals (**μyl** **ḡllv**), bound their tails to one another, put a firebrand between two tails, and let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, which was thus burned up (^{<07154>}Judges 15:4, 5, 8); to have broken, with perfect ease, the new cords, with which his arms were bound, etc. (^{<07154>}Judges 15:14; 16:7-9, 11). Now there is in these and other recorded feats of Samson nothing which ought to create difficulty, for history affords many instances of men of extraordinary strength, of whom Goliath among the Philistines is

not the least remarkable; and for others we refer to T. Ludolf, *Historia, Aethiopiae* 1, 10; to the *Acta Dei per Francos*, 1, 75, 314; and to Schillinger, *Missionsbericht*, 4, 79. Lions were also slain by other persons unarmed, as by David (⁰⁹⁷³1 Samuel 17:36) and Benaiah (¹⁰³³2 Samuel 23:20). It were easy to show that, when properly understood, his other exploits do not necessarily exceed the limits of human power.

Extraordinary indeed they were, but, even if regarded as not alleged by the Scripture itself to have been supernatural, they are far from fabulous. Considering the very remote period at which our book was written — considering also the manner of viewing and describing events and persons which prevailed with the ancient Hebrews, and which very much differs from that of our age — taking, moreover, into account the brevity of the narratives, which consist of historical fragments; we may well wonder that there do not occur in it more difficulties, and that not more doubts have been raised as to its historical authority (see Herder, *Geist der Hebraischen Poesie*, 2, 250, 59; Eichhorn, *Repertorium der Biblischen und Morgenländischen Literatur*, 8, 78). For a further elucidation of the above and other difficulties, see the several subjects in their alphabetical places.

IX. Chronological Difficulties. — The time commonly assigned to the period contained in this book is 299 years. But this number is not derived directly from it. The length of the interval between Joshua's death and the invasion of Chushan-rishathaim, and of the time during which Shamgar was judge, is not stated. The dates which are given amount to 410 years when reckoned consecutively; and ⁴¹³³Acts 13:20 would show that this was the computation commonly adopted, as the 450 years seem to result from adding 40 years for Eli to the 410 of this book. But a difficulty is created by 11:26, and in a still greater degree by ¹⁰⁶³1 Kings 6:1, where the whole period from the exodus to the building of the Temple is stated at 480 years (Septuag. 440). One solution questions the genuineness of the date in 1 Kings. Kennicott pronounces against it (*Diss. Genesis* 80, § 3) because it is omitted by Origen when quoting the rest of the verse. It is also urged that Josephus would not have reckoned 592 years for the same period if the present reading had existed in his time. But it is defended by Thenius (*ad loc.*), and is generally adopted, partly on account of its agreement with Egyptian chronology. Most of the systems therefore shorten the time of the judges by reckoning the dates as inclusive or contemporary. But all these combinations are arbitrary. The same may be said of Keil's scheme, which is one of those least open to objection. He reckons the dates successively

as far as Jair, but makes Jephthah and the three following judges contemporary with the 40 years of the Philistine oppression (comp. 10:6-13:1) and by compressing the period between the division of the land and Chushan-rishathaim into 10 years; and the Philistine wars to the death of Saul into 39, he arrives ultimately at the 480 years. Ewald and Bertheau have proposed ingenious but unsatisfactory explanations — differing in details, but both built upon the supposition that the whole period from the exodus to Solomon was divided into 12 generations of 40 years; and that, for the period of the judges, this system has become blended with the dates of another more precise reckoning.

But the whole theory of the parallel or contemporaneous rule of two or more judges, upon which all these shortenings of the period in question proceed, is purely arbitrary. There is nothing in the book of Judges to warrant the supposition that the national unity was completely broken up, so that there ever were two independent judges ruling different parts of Israel: such a schism first appeared, in the days of Ishbosheth and Jeroboam, and then our attention is strongly called to it. The Ammonitish oppression is distinctly stated to have extended far beyond the eastern tribes, into Judah, and Benjamin, and Ephraim, all being included in that "Israel which they oppressed." Nor is there anything in the history which suggests the restriction of Jephthah's jurisdiction to the east of Jordan. On the contrary, Mizpeh of Gilead (^{<07123>}Judges 11:29) seems to be distinguished from Mizpeh simply so called, where he took up his house (ver. 34), where he uttered all his words before the Lord (ver. 11), and where the children of Israel had assembled themselves together and encamped (^{<07107>}Judges 10:17); and it will be difficult to assign a reason for thinking that this was not the Mizpeh in Benjamin, where at Other times the people of the Lord were used to meet in those days (^{<07201>}Judges 20:1; ^{<00705>}1 Samuel 7:5, 6; 10:17). Jephthah successors, whose rule must also be made contemporary with the Philistine oppression during 40 years, had no special connection whatever with the eastern tribes. Ibzan belonged to Bethlehem, and was buried there; Elon stood in the same relation to the tribe of Zebulun, and Abdon to Pirathon in the land of Ephraim. So far as we know, these are fair specimens of the connections which the judges had with the different localities of the land of Israel, and there is no ground for restricting the rule of one of them more than that of another to a part of the land. We are pretty sure that this was *not* the case with Deborah and Barak, nor with Gideon, nor, certainly, with Samuel; why imagine it with

any of the rest? What time could be suggested less likely for such a revolution in the constitution of Israel than the close of 55 years of peaceful government under two successive judges, in whose administration there was so little to record for the instruction of posterity? Or, if there had been a threatening of such disintegration of the commonwealth, would it not be prevented by the nomination of the high priest Eli to the office of judge? Yet that other supposition of Eli's last 20 years falling under the first 20 of the Philistines compels us to suppose that his first 20 were contemporaneous with Jair's government, down to whose death Keil admits that there is no trace of division: hence he is driven to the desperate resource of denying that Eli was a judge at all, except in the sense in which every high priest might be called by this name. But, had Eli been only a judge during the Philistine servitude, we should expect this to be stated; as in Samson's case. Neither is it easily credible that four judges, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, should rule the eastern tribes in uninterrupted succession, without attempting to drive out the Philistines, and support Samson in his marvelous struggle.

In order to weaken the force of Paul's statement in ^{<4HE3D>}Acts 13:20, which confirms the consecutiveness of the judgeships, recourse has been had to a various reading of that passage, by which it may be rendered, "When he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot in about 450 years, and after that he gave them judges until Samuel the prophet." This reading has the support of our four oldest manuscripts. (Alexandrian, Vatican, Ephraem palimpsest, and Sinaitic), and of the Vulgate, and it has been adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, and others, but not by Tischendorf (7th ed.), Alford, or Meyer. But the various readings of the passage are in such a form as suggests that there had been tampering with the text by the scribes, plainly for the very reason that they felt the chronological difficulty; and no one would have altered the text into the present form, for which there is the authority of the versions generally, and of the fathers who quote it, so as to create a difficulty for themselves. The sense, too, is very unsatisfactory, the 450 years being then understood to run from the birth of Isaac to the division of the land, a computation for which no reason can be given, and which ill agrees with the other statements of time in the context, where there is surely a chronological sequence. It would certainly conflict with the 430 years assigned to the sojourn in Egypt (^{<0124I>}Exodus 12:41), a period computed, as ^{<88F7>}Galatians 3:17 shows, from the call of Abraham, when he was seventy-

five years old (⁴¹²³⁶Genesis 12:4), to the Exode (comp. ⁴¹⁵¹⁶Genesis 15:16). Keil, indeed, makes the inconsistency even worse for himself by reckoning these 430 years from Jacob's descent into Egypt. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*, vol. 2, p. 302.

Picture for Judges

We are compelled, therefore, to understand the periods of oppression and judgeship as immediately successive, and then, arranging them in four periods, as suggested in § 2 above, we may tabulate the whole of the middle part of the history as on the following page.

X. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book of Judges, alone, the most important of Which we designate by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* 2, 457; also in *Bibl. Patr. Gallandii*, 14); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* 4, 308); Theodoret, *Quoestiones* (in *Opp.* 1, 1); Isidorus Hispalensis, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* 1); Bede, *Quoestiones* (in *Opp.* p. 8); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *In Jud.* (in *Opp.* 1, 331); Irimpertus, *Commentarii* (in *Pez. Thesaur.* 4, 1, 127); Rabbi Tanchum, *Commentarii* (from the Arabic, by Schnurrer, Tubing. 1791, 8vo; by Haarbrucher, Hal. 1842, 8vo); Bafiolas, *vWrp* [including Joshua, etc.] (Leira, 1494, folio; also in the Rabbinical Bibles, etc.) Bucer, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1554, 1563, fol.); Borrhäus [Cellarius], *Commentarius* [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Basil. 1557, folio); Lavater, *Homilioe* (Tigur. 1561, 1571, 1582, 1609 fol.) Ferus. *Enarrationes* [including Exodus, etc.] (Colon. 1572 1574 8vo); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lipsiae, 1575, 1586, 8vo); Chytraeus, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1589, 8vo) Peter Martyr, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1561, Lond. 1565, 1576, 1582, Heidelb. 1590, folio); Montanus, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1592, 4to); Heling, *Periocha* (Norib. 1593, 1594, 8vo); Alscheich, *t/arḥi* etc. [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Venice, 1601, 1620; Prague, 1620; Offenb. 1719, fol.); Felibien, *Commentarii* [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Paris, 1604, 4to); Ibn-Chajim, *db̄aiḥi* [includ. Joshua] (Ven. 1609, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible); Serarius, *Explanatio* [includ. Ruth] (Mogunt. 1609, folio); Rogers, *Lectures* (Lond. 1615, fol.); Drusius, *Commentarius* [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Franec. 1618, 4to); Magalianus, *Explanations* (Lugd. 1626, folio); Bonfrere, *Commentarius* [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Paris, 1631, 1659, folio); Villaroel, *Commentarii* (Madr. 1636, fol.); Freyre, *Commentarii* (Olyssip. and Mach. 1642, 4to); Jackson, *Commentary* [includ. Ruth, etc.]. (Cambr.

1646, 2 vols. 4to); De Vega, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1663 sq., 3 vols. fol.); De Naxera, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1664, 3 vols. fol.); *Osiander, *Commentarius* (Tub. 1682, fol.); *S. Schmidt, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1684, 1691, 1706, 4to); Moldenhauer, *Zeitrechnung*, etc. (Hamb. 1766, 8vo); also *Erläuterung* [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Quedlinb. 1774, 8vo); Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lipsiae, 1835, 8vo); Studer, *Erklärung* (Berne, 1835, 1842, 8vo); Herzfeld, *Chronologia*, etc. (Berol. 1836, 8vo); *Bertheau, *Erklärung* [includ. Ruth] (Lpz. 1845, 8vo); Bush, *Notes* (N. York, 1852, 12mo); Noble, *Sermons* (London, 1856, 8vo); Cummings, *Readings* [includ. Joshua] (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Rördam, *Vers. Syriaco-hexapl*, etc. (Havniae, 1859, 4to); Fritzsche, *Secundum Sept.*, etc. (Turici, 1867, 8vo); *Bachmann, *Erklärung* (Berlin, 1867-70, vol. 1, 8vo). **SEE OLD TESTAMENT.**

Judghanites.

SEE JUDAH JUDGHAN.

Judging, Rash,

the act of carelessly, precipitately, wantonly, or maliciously censuring others. This is an evil which abounds too much among almost all classes of men. "Not content with being in the right ourselves, we must find all others in the wrong. We claim an exclusive possession of goodness and wisdom; and from approving warmly of those who join us, we proceed to condemn, with much acrimony, not only the principles, but the characters of those from whom we differ. We rashly extend to every individual the severe opinion which we have unwarrantably conceived of a whole body. This man is of a party whose principles we reckon slavish, and therefore his whole sentiments are corrupted. That man belongs to a religious sect which we are accustomed to deem bigoted, and therefore he is incapable of any generous and liberal thought. Another is connected with a sect which we have been taught to account relaxed, and therefore can have no sanctity. We should do well to consider,

1. That this practice of rash judging is absolutely forbidden in the sacred Scriptures (~~4001~~ Matthew 7:1).
2. We thereby authorize others to requite us in the same kind.
3. It often evidences our pride; envy, and bigotry.

4. It argues a want of charity, the distinguishing feature of the Christian religion.
5. They who are most forward in censuring others are often most defective themselves." See Barrow's *Works*, vol. 1. ser. 20; Blair's *Sermons*, ser. 10, vol. 2; Saurin's *Sermons*, ser. 4, vol. 5.

Judgment,

considered as a technical and scientific term of logic, is an act of the mind by which something is affirmed. In this restricted sense it is one of the simplest acts or operations of which we are conscious in the exercise of our rational powers. The intellectual faculty called judgment is the power of determining anything to be true or false. In every instance of memory or perception there is involved some judgment, some feeling of relationship, of space, or time, or similarity, or contrast. Consciousness necessarily involves a judgment; and, as every act of mind is an act of consciousness, every act of mind consequently involves a judgment. It is a process not only subsequent to the acquisition of knowledge, but "involved as a condition of the acquisitive process itself." There is not only included what is popularly understood as comparison (when the properties of bodies are compared), but that elementary faculty, that fundamental law or innate idea, which, in the first instance, makes us cognizant of the property. Hence Sir William Hamilton's division into derivative and primitive cognitions, the derivative being of our own fabrication, formed from certain rules, and being the tardy result of perception and memory, of attention, reflection, abstraction. These are derived from experience, and, as such, are contingent; and as all experience is contingent, all the knowledge derived from experience is contingent also. But, as there are conditions of the mind which are not contingent, which are necessary, which we cannot but think, which thought supposes as its fundamental condition, these are denominated primitive cognitions; these primitive and general notions being the root of all principles, the foundation of the whole edifice of science. For the discovery of this great truth we are indebted to Leibnitz, who, in controverting Locke's view of innate ideas, asserted the existence of a principle of human knowledge independent of and superior to that which is afforded by the senses. Kant, adopting Leibnitz' view, furnishes a test by which these two elements are distinguished from each other: the former, being contingent, are fluctuating and uncertain; they may be in the mind, or they may not. Every fresh scene in which we are placed

completely alters the sensations, and the particular sensational judgments of which we are conscious. On the contrary, our primitive judgments are steady, abiding, unalterable. These primitive judgments, he asserts, are of two kinds, analytic and synthetic. An analytic judgment is simply a declaration of something necessarily belonging to a given notion, as that every triangle has three sides. A synthetic judgment may be a declaration of something which does not actually belong to a notion, but which our minds are led, by some kind of evidence or other, to attribute to it, as "Every event has an efficient cause." Here we do more than analyze the expression; we attribute altogether a fresh notion to it, and form a judgment by which our knowledge is extended. Both these judgments are found in the pure sciences, and form the very principles upon which they are pursued. It may be well to remark, however, that Comte, Herbert Spencer, Mill, etc., following Locke; deny the existence of these primitive judgments altogether, even the axioms which stand at the head of mathematical reasoning. So far from being mental and subjective, they are truly inductive, derived from observation; only *that* observation is so constant, and *that* induction is so easy and immediate, that we fall easily into an impression that these laws are intuitive, whereas they are, in fact, experimental. For instance, the axioms and postulates which are the basis of Euclid's Geometry are not metaphysical — written on the intellect, and, drawn out of the brain — they are only statements of laws observed and experienced. See Watts, *Logic*, ch. 4, p. 231; Locke, *On the Understanding*, 1, 222, 256; 2, 271, 278; Duncan, *Logic*, p. 145; Reid, *On the Intellectual Powers*, p. 497, etc. (E. de P.)

Judgment, Right Of Private.

The Church of Rome denies the right as claimed by Protestants on the following grounds: that the Church, being assisted by the Spirit of God in searching the Scriptures, having the promise of the presence of Jesus to the end of the world, and having the possession of the unwritten word as a commentary on the written, is the only safe interpreter of holy Scripture, and the supreme judge by whose definitive sentence all controversies with regard to the meaning of particular passages or the general doctrine of holy Scripture must be determined. It makes a distinction, however, between the learned exegesis, as applied to the sacred writings, and that interpretation which emanates from the Church. The interpretation of the Church does not descend to the details which must claim the attention of the scientific exegetist. Thus, for example, she does not hold it her duty, nor include it in

the compass of her rights, to determine when, by whom, and for what object. the book of Job was written; or what particular inducement engaged St. John to publish his Gospel, or St. Paul to address an epistle to the Romans; in what order of time the epistles of the apostle followed each other, etc. As little does she undertake to explain particular words and verses, their bearings one on the other, or the connection existing between larger portions of the sacred book. Antiquities, in the widest sense of the word, fall not within the domain of her interpretation; in short, that interpretation extends only to doctrines of faith and morals. Within these limits she declares it to be the duty of Christians to acquiesce in this infallible determination, and that it is presumption and impiety, and a sin for which they deserve everlasting punishment, to oppose their own private judgment, which cannot of itself attain the truth, to the decision of the Church, which cannot err.

To this extraordinary claim Protestants agree in opposing this principle, that the holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith. But, while there is a general agreement as to this, i.e. to receive the Scriptures as a sufficient rule of faith, and as the only authoritative rule, there are wide diversities of opinion concerning the power reserved to the Church as to the doctrines of religion. The extreme view is that the Church at no time possesses the right of intermeddling in articles of faith. The essential articles of faith are so few, so simple, and so easily gathered out of clear and explicit passages, that it is impossible for any man who has the exercise of his reason to miss them; that no harm can arise from allowing any man to interpret the Scriptures as he pleases; and that, as Scripture may be sufficiently understood for purposes of salvation without any foreign assistance, all creeds and confessions of faith composed and prescribed by human authority are an encroachment upon the prerogative of the supreme Teacher, and an invasion of the right of private judgment. Such furthermore maintain that all divisions among Christians have grown out of the attempt of the Church to force upon Christians uniformity of belief as to the doctrines of holy Scripture.

This view of the right of private judgment is generally held by the followers of Socinus, and among its ablest champions at the present day are some of the leading minds of the Church of England, who, on account of their peculiar views, are denominated Moderate, Catholic, Broad Church, by the friends of that party; Latitudinarian, or Indifferent, by its enemies. Believing that the superficial differences between Christians are as nothing

in comparison with their essential agreement, they are willing that the portals of the Church should be flung as wide open as the gates of heaven. This is clearly set forth by the late Dr. Arnold: "All societies of men, whether we call them states or churches, should make their bond to consist in a common object and a common practice rather than in a common belief; in other words, their end should be good rather than truth. We may consent to act together, but we cannot consent to believe together; many motives may persuade us to the one: we may like the object, or we may like our company, or we may think it safest to join them, or most convenient, and any one of these motives is quite sufficient to induce a unity of action, action being a thing in our own power. But no motives can persuade us to believe together; we may wish a statement to be true, we may admire those who believe it, we may find it very inconvenient not to believe it; all this helps us nothing; unless our own mind is freely convinced that the statement or doctrine is true, we cannot by possibility believe it.

"Such a union of action appears historically to have been the original bond of the Christian Church. Whoever was willing to receive Christ as his Master, to join his people, and to walk according to his rules, was admitted to the Christian society. We know that in the earliest Church there existed the strangest varieties of belief, some Christians not even believing that there would be a resurrection of the dead. Of course it was not intended that such varieties should be perpetual; a closer union of belief was gradually effected; but the point to observe is that the union of belief grew out of the union of action; it was the result of belonging to the society rather than a previous condition required for belonging to it, for no human power can presume to inquire into the degree of a man's positive belief. A general, hearty belief in Christianity is to be regarded by the Church, not as its starting point, but as its highest perfection. To begin with a strict creed and no efficient Christian institutions is the sure way to hypocrisy and unbelief; to begin with the most general confession of faith imputed, that is, as a test of membership, but with vigorous Christian institutions, is the way most likely to lead not only to a real and general belief, but also to a lively perception of the highest points of Christian faith. In other words, intellectual objections to Christianity should be tolerated when they are combined with moral obedience; tolerated, because in this way they are most surely removed; whereas a corrupt or disorganized Church, with a minute creed, encourages intellectual objections; and if it proceeds to put them down by force, it does often violate the right of conscience, punishing

an unbelief which its own evil had provoked, and, so far as human judgment can see, has in a great measure justified. In primitive usage, a heretic was not properly he who did not believe what the Church taught, but he who willfully withdrew himself from its society, refusing to conform to its system, and setting up another system of his own."

To most Protestants, however, this plan seems very defective. Regarding the Christian Church as a society created by divine institution, it possesses all the authority which Christ meant to convey through his apostles to their successors, and of the exercise of which the apostles have left examples. They deem it to be incontrovertible that these successive teachers in the Christian Church were intended to be interpreters and expounders of the sacred book; that they are invested with authority in relation to the doctrines of holy Scripture; and that, as a mere acknowledgment of the truth of Scripture is not a sufficient security or soundness of faith, it is lawful for the Church to employ additional guards to that "form of sound words" which it is required to hold fast and to defend. It is one thing to say that the Bible is the rule of faith, and another to say that it is the judge to determine what that rule is. The latter it can as little be as the code of civil law can exercise the functions of the judge; it forms indeed, the rule of judgment, but it does not itself pronounce judgment. Hence the twentieth article of the Church of England declares that "the Church hath authority in matters of faith." So the Westminster Confession "It belongeth to synods and councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith." See Rogers. *Reason and Faith*; Wilson, *Apostolic Fathers*; Elliot, *Delineation of Romanism* (see Index); Litton, *Church, of Christ*, p. 7 sq. (E. de P.)

Judgment, The Last

the sentence that will be passed on our actions at the last day when the everlasting designs of God concerning this lower creation shall be accomplished, an end put to time and the destinies of the human race fixed for eternity. This is one of the peculiar doctrines of revelation, a doctrine of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. There were, indeed, some hints of it in the Old Testament; but it is in the New Testament that we have it frequently and particularly declared and described, with the circumstances with which it will be attended. It is a doctrine, too, which is entirely agreeable to reason, which fully concurs with revelation in directing our minds to a state of retribution, there being no alternative, if we hold not the truth of a judgment to come, but the holding that the creation is not under a moral

government. For, on the one hand, there is no doubt that we live under a retributive government, and that cognizance is taken of our actions by an invisible but ever present Being, whose attributes render him the determined foe of vice, and the steadfast upholder of righteousness. On the other hand, there has been an irresistible demonstration, from the experience of all ages, that no accurate proportion is at present maintained between conduct and condition. The wicked triumph in their iniquity, while virtue is despised; her humble votaries are borne down by the gloom of adversity, or reared in the midst of sorrows and tears. In every age of the world, therefore, men have been perplexed by what seemed opposite evidences as to the superintending care of a wise and beneficent Being. The only way to escape the difficulty is an appeal to the future; for either the idea is erroneous of one living under a moral government at all, or that moral government must have another scene of display where its impartiality shall be vindicated, and every discrepancy removed. See Fuller, *Works*, 2, 78, 106, 152, 211, 367, 392, 437, 841, 859, 871, 883, 906; Dwight, *Theology*; Irving, *Argument for Judgment to come*. *SEE JUDGMENT DAY*. (E. de P.)

Judgment Day

a term generally used to designate that important day which is to terminate the present dispensation of grace; at the end of the world, when time shall be no more, and the eternal state of all men be unchangeably fixed (^{<6007>}2 Peter 3:7).

I. *Proof of a general Judgment.* — The arguments for this are these:

- 1.** The justice of God requires it; for it is evident that this attribute is not clearly displayed in the dispensation of things in the present state (^{<5006>}2 Thessalonians 1:6, 7; ^{<2144>}Luke 14:14).
- 2.** The accusations of natural conscience are testimonies in favor of this belief (^{<5125>}Romans 2:15; ^{<2185>}Daniel 5:5, 6; ^{<4225>}Acts 24:25).
- 3.** It may be concluded, from the relation men stand in to God, as creatures to a Creator. He has a right to give them a law, and to make them accountable for the breach of it (^{<5142>}Romans 14:12).
- 4.** The resurrection of Christ is a certain proof of it. See ^{<4473>}Acts 17:31; ^{<5149>}Romans 14:9,

5. The Scripture, in a variety of places, sets it beyond all doubt (^{<6014>}Jude 1:14:15; ^{<450>}2 Corinthians 5:10; ^{<4201>}Matthew 25; ^{<6140>}Romans 14:10, 11; ^{<3002>}2 Thessalonians 1:7, 10; ^{<5046>}1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17). *SEE JUDGMENT, LAST.*

II. *The Judge.* — The Bible declares that God will judge the world by Jesus Christ (^{<4473>}Acts 17:31). The triune God will be the Judge, as to original authority, power, and right of judgment; but according to the economy settled between the three divine persons the work is assigned to the Son (^{<6140>}Romans 14:9, 10), who will appear in his human nature (^{<4872>}John 5:27; ^{<4473>}Acts 17:31), with great power and glory (^{<5046>}1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17); visible to every eye (^{<6000>}Revelation 1:7); penetrating every heart. (^{<4005>}1 Corinthians 4:5; ^{<6126>}Romans 2:16); with full authority over all (^{<4088>}Matthew 28:18) and acting with strict justice (^{<5048>}2 Timothy 4:8). As far the concern of others in the judgment, angels will be no otherwise concerned than as attendants. gathering the elect, raising the dead. etc. But not as advising or judging. Saints are said to judge the world! not as cojudges with Christ, but as approvers of his sentence and as their holy lives and exhortations will rise up in judgment against their wicked neighbors (^{<4400>}1 Corinthians 6:2, 3).

III. *The Persons that will be judged.* — These will be men and devils. The righteous will probably be tried first as represented in ^{<4201>}Matthew 25. They will be raised first though perhaps not a thousand years before the rest, as some have supposed [see Millennium]; since the resurrection of all the bodies of the saints is spoken of as in a moment in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump, in order to their meeting the Lord in the air, and being with him, not on earth, but forever in heaven (^{<4652>}1 Corinthians 15:52; ^{<5046>}1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17).

IV. *The Rule of Judgment.* — We are informed that the books will be opened (^{<6012>}Revelation 20:12);

- 1.** The book of divine omniscience (^{<3005>}Malachi 3:5 or remembrance (^{<3005>}Malachi 3:15);
- 2.** The book of conscience (^{<6126>}Romans 2:16);
- 3.** The book of Providence (^{<6124>}Romans 2:4, 5);

4. The book of the Scriptures, law, and Gospel (^{<6124>}John 12:48; ^{<6122>}Romans 2:12, 16);
5. The book of life (^{<2111>}Luke 10:20; ^{<6115>}Revelation 3:5; 20:12, 15).

V. The Time of Judgment.-The soul will be either happy or miserable immediately after death, but the general judgment will not be till after the resurrection (^{<5027>}Hebrews 9:27). There is a day appointed (^{<4173>}Acts 17:3.1), but it is unknown to men. *SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE.*

VI. The Place.-This is also uncertain. Some suppose it will be in the air, because the judge will come in the clouds of heaven, and the living saints will then be changed, and the dead saints raised, and both be caught up to meet the Lord in the air (^{<3416>}1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17). Others think it will be on the earth, on the new earth, on which they will descend from the air with Christ. The place where, however, is of no consequence, when compared with the state in which we shall appear. As the Scriptures represent it as certain (^{<2119>}Ecclesiastes 11:9), universal (^{<4511>}2 Corinthians 5:11), righteous (^{<6115>}Romans 2:5), decisive (^{<4352>}1 Corinthians 15:52), and eternal as to its consequences (^{<5112>}Hebrews 6:2), let us be concerned for the welfare of our immortal interests, flee to the refuge set before us, improve our precious time, depend on the merits of the Redeemer, and adhere to the dictates of the divine Word, that we may be found of him in peace. See Bates, *Works*, p. 449; Hopkins and Stoddard, *On the Last Judgment*; Gill, *Body of Divinity*, 2, 467, 8vo; Boston, *Fourfold State*; Hervey, *Works*, new edition, 1, 72, 75; 2, 28, 223; 4, 155. *SEE RESURRECTION.*

Judgment hall.

SEE PRAETORIUM.

Judgment seat

Picture for Judgement-seat

(βῆμα, properly a *step*, hence a rostrum or stage for speakers; as a "throne," e.g. Herod's in the theater at Caesarea, ^{<4121>}Acts 12:21), an elevated seat or *tribunal* (in ^{<5116>}James 2:6, the term is κριτήριον, a court of justice), especially of the Roman governor (^{<4279>}Matthew 27:19; ^{<6113>}John 19:13; ^{<4182>}Acts 18:12, 16, 17; 25:6, 10, 17); hence of the final bar of God (^{<6440>}Romans 14:10; ^{<4510>}2 Corinthians 5:10). *SEE PAVEMENT.*

Judgments Of God.

1. This expression is of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures, and its sense is generally determined by the connection. When God's judgments are spoken of, the term may denote either the secret decisions of the divine will (^{<1005>}Psalm 10:5a; 36:6), or the declarations of God's will revealed in the Scriptures (^{<1201>}Exodus 21:1; ^{<1372>}Deuteronomy 7:12; ^{<1493>}Nehemiah 9:13; ^{<1307>}Psalm 119:7-175), or the inflictions of punishment on the wicked (^{<1016>}Exodus 6:6; 12:12; ^{<1429>}Proverbs 19:29; ^{<1251>}Ezekiel 25:11; ^{<1607>}Revelation 16:7). The Scriptures give us many awful instances of the display of divine justice in the punishment of nations, families, and individuals for their iniquities. See ^{<1070>}Genesis 7; 19:25; ^{<1251>}Exodus 15; ^{<1006>}Judges 1:6, 7; ^{<1123>}Acts 12:23; ^{<1754>}Esther 5:14, with 7:10; ^{<1210>}2 Kings 11; ^{<1301>}Leviticus 10:1, 2; ^{<1471>}Acts 5:1-10; ^{<1311>}Isaiah 30:1-5; ^{<1153>}1 Samuel 15:9; ^{<1125>}1 Kings 12:25, 33.

2. In a less legitimate application, the strange trials to which those suspected of guilt were put in the Middle Ages, conducted with many devout ceremonies by the ministers of religion, and pronounced to be the *judgments of God!* The ordeal consisted of various kinds: walking blindfold amid burning ploughshares, holding in the hand a red-hot bar, and plunging the arm into boiling water. The popular affirmations, "I will put my hand into the fire to confirm this," appears to be derived from this solemn custom. Challenging the accuser to single combat, when frequently the stoutest champion was allowed to supply their place; swallowing a morsel of consecrated bread; sinking or swimming in a river for witchcraft, or weighing a witch; stretching out the arms before the cross, till the champion soonest wearied dropped his arms and lost his estate, which was decided by the very short chancery suit called *the judicium crucis*.

Those who were accused of robbery were put to trial by a piece of barley bread, on which the mass had been said, and, if they could not swallow it, were declared guilty. Probably the saying, "May this piece of bread choke me," comes from this custom. Among the proofs of guilt was that of *the bleeding of a corpse*. If a person was murdered, it was believed that at the touch or approach of the murderer the blood gushed out of the body in various parts. By the side of the bier, if the slightest change was observable in the eyes, the mouth, feet; or hands of the corpse, the murderer was conjectured to be present; and it is probable that many innocent spectators have suffered death in consequence.

It is well to mark, in extenuation of these absurd practices of our rude ancestors, that these customs were a substitute for written laws which that barbarous period had not; and as no community can exist without *laws*, the ignorance of the people had recourse to these *customs*, which, bad and absurd as they were, served to close controversies which otherwise might have given birth to more destructive practices. Ordeals are, in truth, the rude laws of a barbarous people who have not yet obtained a written code, and not advanced enough in civilization to enter into refined inquiries, the subtle distinctions and elaborate investigations which a court of law demands.

It is a well-established fact, however, that they were acquainted in those times with *secrets* to pass unhurt these singular trials. This was especially the case with ordeals of fire and boiling water. Doubtless the more knowing ones possessed those secrets and medicaments which they had at hand to pass through these trials in perfect security. See Jortin, *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* 3, 246, sq. **SEE ORDEAL.** (E. de P.)

Judicature, Courts Of.

SEE JUDGE; SEE COURT; SEE TRIAL; SEE TRIBUNAL; SEE COUNCIL, etc.

Judices Electi,

select judges, is a term applied to a number of judges occasionally selected to hear an appeal from an excommunicated presbyter or deacon against his own bishop. The Council of Sardica allowed an appeal to the metropolitan; and in such a case the metropolitan had three ways of proceeding—either to select a number of judges, generally twelve, to hear the case; or to refer the matter to a provincial synod; or to hear the causes himself without a synod. It is, however, doubtful whether a metropolitan had power to depose a bishop.

Judicial Blindness Or Hardness,

a term employed to express a state of moral incorrigibility. So we read, ^{<1005>}Mark 3:5, "Being grieved for the *blindness — hardness —* of their hearts." So ^{<6125>}Romans 11:25, "*Blindness — hardness —* in part hath happened to Israel." ^{<4048>}Ephesians 4:18, "Because of the *blindness — hardness —* of their hearts." ^{<1014>}2 Corinthians 3:14, "Their minds were

blinded — hardened;" and elsewhere. This expression is of special interest to the theologian on account of two questions connected with it.

1. Is it an infliction of God? — From such passages as ^{<2160>}Isaiah 6:10, some have said that God commands the prophet to do a certain thing to this peoples and then punishes the people: nay, this appears stronger still, where the passage is quoted, as (^{<3124>}John 12:40), He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts; which seems to be contradictory to ^{<1035>}Matthew 13:15, where: the people themselves are said to have closed their own eyes; and so ^{<4027>}Acts 28:27. These seeming contradictions are very easily reconciled. God, by giving plenty and abundance, affords the means of the people's abusing his goodness, and, becoming both over fat with food and intoxicated with drink; and thus his very beneficence may be said to make their heart fat, and their eyes heavy, while at the same time the people, by their own act, their overfeeding, become unwieldy, indolent, bloated, over fat at heart, and, moreover, so stupefied by liquor and strong drink, that their eyes and ears may be useless to them: with wide open eyes, "staring, they may stare, but not perceive; and listening, they may hear, but not understand; and in this lethargic state they will continue, preferring it to a more sedate, rational condition, and refusing to forbear from prolonging the causes of it, lest at any sober interval they should see truly with their eyes and hear accurately with their ears, in consequence of which they should be shocked at themselves, be converted, be changed from such misconduct, and I should heal them — should cure these delusory effects of their surfeits and dissoluteness. Comp. ^{<2351>}Isaiah 5:11; 28:7. This is equally true in spiritual matters. In short, the expressions in question are to be understood in the same sense as the hardening of Pharaoh's heart under a perversion by his own willfulness of the providences of God (^{<817>}Romans 9:17, 18). *SEE PREDESTINATION.*

2. Is this state hopeless? — That sinners may, by a course of persistent opposition to God, so far destroy or deaden their conscience as to be beyond the hope (but not absolutely the power) of divine grace, is a fearful fact, and one corroborated by the Holy Scriptures (^{<5012>}1 Timothy 4:2; ^{<8128>}Romans 1:28; ^{<5111>}2 Thessalonians 2:11, ^{<3116>}Hebrews 6:6). But this condition, again, is not so much the result of God's determination as of their own inveterate perversity. *SEE UNPARDONABLE SIN.*

Judicium Dei.

SEE JUDGMENTS OF GOD.

Ju'dith

(Heb. *Yehudith*, 'tydwy] *Jewess*; Septuag. Ἰουδίθ), the name of two females; properly the feminine form of ydwy] *Judoeus* (comp. ⁻²⁸⁶⁴Jeremiah 36:14, 21); but in the passage of Genesis it is generally taken as the correlative of *Judah*. i.e. "*praised*."

1. The daughter of Beeri, the Hittite and one of the first two wives of Esau (⁻⁰²⁵⁴Genesis 26:34). She is elsewhere more correctly called AHOLIBAMAH, the daughter of Anah the Horite (⁻⁰³⁶²Genesis 36:2-14). *SEE ESAU.*

2. The heroine of the apocryphal book which bears her name, who appears as an ideal type of piety (Jud. 8:6), beauty (11:21), courage, and chastity (16:22 sq.). Her supposed descent from Simeon (9:2), and the manner in which she refers to his cruel deed (⁻⁰³²⁵Genesis 34:25 sq.), mark the conception of the character, which evidently belongs to a period of stern and perilous conflict. The most unscrupulous daring (ch. 13) is combined with zealous ritualism (12:1 sq.), and faith is turned to action rather than to supplication (8:31 sq.). Clement of Rome (Ep. 1:55) assigns to Judith the epithet given to Jael (Ἰουδέιθ ἡ μακαρία); and Jerome sees in her exploit the image of the victory of the Church over the power of evil (Ep. 79:11, p. 508; Judith... in typo Ecclesiae diabolum capite truncavit; compare Ep. 22:21, p. 105). According to the Greek text, Judith was the rich widow of Manasses of Bethulia; to which the Vulgate adds that she was the daughter of Merari, or more properly Beari (yrab), as the Hebrew recension has it; the latter also places her in the days of Maccabaeus, which is undoubtedly correct. *SEE JUDITH, BOOK OF.*

Judith, Book Of,

one of the most interesting of the apocryphal books, which has called forth a greater variety of opinions among interpreters since the days of the Reformation than almost any other of the Deutero-canonical productions. Its historical bearings are especially important.

I. Title and Position of the Book. — The book is named after its heroine, **Judith**. St. Jerome's opinion, that it is so called because Judith was the authoress of it (*Comment in Agg.* 1, 6), is rightly rejected by every scholar. In the MSS. of the Alexandrine version, the Vulgate, and in Wycliffe's translation, Judith is placed between Tobit and Esther. This is followed by Coverdale, the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, and the A.V., where, from the nature of the division, it is put between Tobit and *the apocryphal* Esther. In the Vatican copies it is placed between Tobit and the Wisdom of Solomon; in the Zurich Bible, between Baruch and the apocryphal Esther; while Luther puts it at the head of the apocryphal books.

II. Design and Contents of the Book. — *The* object of this book evidently is to show that as long as God's people walk in his commandments blamelessly, no matter how distressing the circumstances in which they may temporarily be placed, the Lord will not suffer the enemy to triumph over them, but will in due time appear for their deliverance, and cause even those who are not Jews to acknowledge that the God of Israel is the only true God. In its external form this book bears the character of the record of a historical event, describing the complete defeat of the Assyrians by the Jews through the prowess of a woman.

In the twelfth year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar, or, as he is called in the Greek, Nabuchodonosor, king of Assyria in Nineveh, assisted by the nations who dwelt in the hill country, by Euphrates, Tigris, Hydaspes, and by the plain of Arioch, king of the Elyrmeans, made war against Arphaxad, king of Media, who had fortified himself in Ecbatana (1:1-7); and, despite the inhabitants of the countries of the west, Persia, Libanus, anti-Libanus, Carmel, Galaad, Galilee, Esdraelon, Samaria, etc., refusing their aid (ver. 8-12), conquered Arphaxad, and returned home. to Nineveh in the seventeenth year of his reign (ver. 13-16). The following year, determined to carry out his resolution to wreak his vengeance on those nations who refused their aid, he dispatched his chief general Holofernes, at the head of 120,000 infantry and 12,000 cavalry (2:1-22), who soon subdued Mesopotamia, Syria, Libya, Cilicia, and Idumsma (2:23; 3, 8), and marched on Judaea (ver. 9, 10). The inhabitants of the seacoast made a voluntary submissions, which, however, did not prevent their territories from being laid waste, their sacred groves burned, and their idols destroyed, in order that divine honors should be paid only to Nebuchadnezzar. Holofernes,

having finally encamped in the plain of Esdraelon (1:3), remained inactive for a whole month or two, according to the Latin version. But the children of Israel, who had newly returned from the captivity, having heard of Holofernes' atrocities, and being afraid of his despoiling the Temple, determined to resist the enemy, and prepared for war under the direction of their high priest Joachim, or Eiiakim, and the senate. They at once took possession of the high mountains arid fortified villages (4:1-5). while the inhabitants of Beth-Ilia and Betomestham, according to the colimand of the high priest Joachim, guarded the passes of the mountains near Dothlaim (ver. 6-8); and, having made all the necessary preparations, they held a solemn fast and prayed to God for protection (ver. 9-15). Enraged, as well as astonished at their audacity in preparing to fight against him, Holofernes made inquiries of the chiefs of Ammon and Moab who this people was (5:1-4). Achior, the leader of the Ammonites, then gives him the history of the Jews, and tells him that no. power could vanquish them unless they sin against their God (ver. 5-21). The proud army, however, becomes exceedingly angry with this statement (6:1-9), and Holofernes orders Achior to be thrown into the Jewish camp, in order that he may be destroyed in the general destruction which was impending over the people whom he described as invincible (ver. 10-13). The Jews pick him up, and lead him to the governor of Bethulia, to whom he relates this, and who comforts him (ver. 14-21). The next day Holofernes marches against Bethulia, takes the mountain passes, seizes all the supplies of water (7:1-7), and lays siege to the city (ver. 8-19), which lasts forty days, when the famishing people urge upon the governor Ozias to surrender it, and he decides to do so unless relieved within five days (ver. 20-32). The pious widow Judith, however, denounces. this decision as tempting the Almighty (8:1-31), and conceives a plan for delivering the people (ver. 32-36). With this view she entreats the governor and elders to give up all idea of surrender, and to permit the gates of the city to be opened for her. Having prayed to the God of her fathers for the overthrow of the enemy (9:1-14), she arrays herself in rich attire, an, a accompanied by her maid, who carries a bag of provision, goes to the camp of Holofernes (10:1-11).,The guards, seeing this beautiful woman, and hearing her story, conduct her to the general (ver. 12-23), whom she tells that the Jews would now be vanquished, because they had sinned against God in eating the victuals consecrated to the Temple (11:1-15); that she had fled from the impending destruction, and would show him the access to the city, only requesting that she should be permitted to go out of the camp to pray in the night

(ver. 16-19). Holofernes, smitten with her charms, gives her a sumptuous entertainment, and invites her to remain alone with him within the tent that night (12:1-20). When heavily asleep in consequence of having drunk too freely, Judith seizes his falchion, strikes off his head, gives it to her maid outside, who puts it in the bag which contained the provisions; they both leave the camp as usual under the pretence of devotion, and return to Bethulia, displaying the head of Holofernes, amidst the rejoicings and thanksgivings of the people (13:1-20). Achior, hearing of this wonderful deliverance, is at once converted to, Judaism, while Judith counsels the Israelites to surprise the enemy next morning (14:1-10), who, being panic stricken at the loss of their general, are soon discomfited, leaving immense spoil in the hands of the Jews (14:11-15:11). The women of Israel then express their gratitude to their sister (ver. 12-13), while Judith bursts forth in a sublime song of praise to the God of their salvation (16:1-17), whereupon all of them go up to Jerusalem to worship the Lord with sacrifices and feastings (ver. 18-20). Judith afterwards returns to her native place, Bethulia, manumits her maid, and dies at the advanced age of 105 years, greatly lamented by all the nation, whose peace no enemy dared to disturb for a long time (ver. 21-25). The Jews enjoying a profound and happy peace, a yearly festival (according to the Vulgate) is instituted in honor of the victory.

III. *Original Language, Versions, Condition of the Texts, etc.* — That this book was originally written in Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic is distinctly declared by St. Jerome, who says that "Judith is read by the Jews among the Hagiographa... and, *being written in Chaldee* (Chaldaeo sermone conscriptus), is reckoned among the histories," and that he had used a Chaldee codex to correct — thereby the vitiated readings of the MSS. (*Proef. ad Jud.*). This is, moreover, corroborated by the byzantine historian John Malalas (fl. circa A.D. 880), who, having embodied the contents of Judith in his Chronographia, remarks, **Ταῦτα δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ἑβραϊκαῖς ἐμφέρεται γραφαῖς** (1, 203, ed. Oxon. 1691). Besides, the Greek contains unmistakable indications that it was made from a Hebrew or Aramaean original, e.g. giving the Hebrew use of the relative **ἐν ᾧ διέτριβεν ἐν αὐτῷ** (10:2), **ὡν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν** (16:4), the literal rendering of **הַיָּמִים**, **ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ** (12:7), which has occasioned so much difficulty to interpreters, but which is easy enough when it is borne in mind that the Hebrew preposition **ב** signifies *at, by, near*; the many Hebraisms (1:7, 16; 2:5, 7, 18, 23; 3:3, 10; 4:2, 6, 11, 13; 5:9, 12, 14, 16,

18; 7:15, 18; 9:8; 10:7, 23; 11:5, 16; 12:13, 20; 14:19); and the mistranslations of the Hebrew (1:8; 2:2; 3:1, 9, 10; 5:15, 18; 8:27; 15:11). Gesenius, and especially Movers, have been very successful in their efforts to correct the present geographical errors by the supposition of a Hebrew original. Betani (1:9) the latter conceives to be Beth-anoth (¹⁶⁵⁰Joshua 15), and the *two seas* (1:12) the two arms of the Nile. For *χαλλαίων* he reads *χαλδαίων*, and considers Rasses to be an oversight for Tarshish. Origen was therefore misinformed when he was told that Judith did not exist in the Hebrew (περὶ Τωβία ἡμᾶς ἐχρῆν ἐγνωκέναι ὅτι τῷ Τωβίᾳ οὐ χρῶνται οὐδέ τῇ Ἰουδίθ, οὐδέ γὰρ ἔχουσι αὐτὰ καὶ ἐν Ἀποκρύφοις Ἑβραϊσταί, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἐν ἐγνώκαμεν, *Ep. ad Afric.*, sec. 13). The *Old Latin* and the Syriac versions were made from the Septuagint, which, however, does not represent a *fixed* Hebrew or Aramaean original text, as may be seen from the various recensions of it differing greatly from each other. This is, moreover, corroborated by the fact that the *Old Latin*, the MSS. of which also deviated greatly from each other, and which St. Jerome corrected according to an Aramaean codex, differs materially from the Sept., sometimes having more than the latter (comp. Vulg. 4:8-15 with Sept. 4:10; Vulg. 5:11, 12 with Sept. 5:11-16; Vulg. 5:26-29 with Septuag. 5, 23-25; Vulg. 6:15-19 with Sept. 6:19; Vulg. 7:18-20 with Sept. 7:29), sometimes less (comp. Vulg. 7:9 sq., with Sept. 7:8-15; Vulg. 5:11 sq., with Sept. 5:17-22; Vulg. 9:5-7, 11 sq., with Sept. 9:7, 10). Sometimes the names are different (comp. 1:6, 8, 9; 4:5; 8:1), and sometimes the numbers (1:2; 2:1; 7:2, etc.). A very minute collation of the variations between the Vulgate and the Sept.' is given by Capellus, *Commentarii et Notae Criticae in V. T.* (Amstel. 1689), p. 574, etc.; and Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften*, p. 318, etc. There are also extant several Hebrew recensions of Judith. Three of these have been published by Jellinek in his *Beth Ha-Midrash*, vols. 1 and 2, Leipzig, 1853, and the one which comes nearest to the Greek and Latin versions certainly removes all the difficulties against the historical character of the book contained in those versions. They are called *hkwj l çrdm tydwhy hc [m* (*Beth Ha-Midrash*, 1, 130-136), and *tydwhy hc [m* (2:12-22). Other Hebrew editions (*tydwhy]hc [m*) have been published at Berlin (1766, 8vo), Venice (s.a. 8vo), and Frankfort-on-the-Main (ed. S., London, 1715, 8vo). Coverdale and the Bishops' Bible, following Luther and the Zurich Bible, have translated from the Vulgate, while the Geneva version, which is followed by the A.V. has a translation of the Greek text.

IV. Historical Character of the Book. — There are three theories about the nature of this book:

a. Up to the time of the Reformation, the view that this book records *actual history* was universally entertained among Christians. The difference of opinion which obtained during those fifteen centuries, and which still exists among the defenders of its historical character, is about the precise time when these events occurred, involving as a necessary consequence the identification of the principal characters, etc. The limits of the range of time within which they have alternately been placed are B.C. 784-A.D. 117. The most ancient opinion, however, is, that the circumstances here described occurred *after* the Babylonian captivity, which is supported by the book itself (comp. 4:3; 5:18, 19, Sept.; 5:22, 23, Vulg.). Still, as it does not tell who this Nebuchadnezzar was, the advocates of this view have tried to identify him with every Persian monarch in succession. Thus, St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, 18, 16), and others, take him to be *Cambyses*; Julius Africanus and Georgius. Syncellus regard him as *Xerxes*: Mercator, Estius, etc., make him to be *Darius Hystaspis*; while Sulpicius Severus and others identify him with *Artaxerxes Ochus* (comp. Suidas, s.v. Judith; Bellarmine, *De Verb. Dei*, 1, 12; Scholz, *Einleitung in die Heiligen Schriften*, 2, 588 sq.). Against this view, however, is to be urged, that,

- 1.** All these monarchs *inherited* the provinces which are described in this book as having been *conquered for them* by Holofernes, thus precluding the identity of any one of them with Nebuchadnezzar.
- 2.** Nineveh, which is here mentioned as the capital of Nebuchadnezzar's, or the Assyrian empire, was destroyed before the Babylonian captivity, and no Assyrian or Median kingdom existed during the post-exilian period.
- 3.** The Persians, Syrianis, Phoenicians, Cilicians, and Egyptians are described as subject to the Assyrians, which could not have been the case after the captivity of Judah, when the Assyrian empire was wholly extinguished, and the Persians, instead of being subject to the Assyrians, had made themselves lords over them, and all the other nations of the East, from the Hellespont to the River Indus.
- 4.** There is no point of time except the Maccabaeen period when the events here recorded could possibly have occurred, since the Jews were subject to the Persians for 207 years, then were under the dominion of Alexander the Great, and finally under the Ptolemies and the kings of Syria till they

obtained their independence through Judas Maccabaeus, B.C. 164. The only time to which they could possibly be referred is that of Antiochus Epiphanes, but this supposition is inconsistent with the fact that the Jews had but recently returned from captivity, and restored the worship of God in the Temple. The geographical inconsistencies are equally embarrassing.

To escape these difficulties, and more especially to obtain a point of time suitable for these events, Usher, Lloyd, Calmet, Montfaucon, Prideaux, Whiston, Wolff, etc., maintain that they occurred *before the exile*, either in the reign of Zedekiah, Manasseh, Amon, Josiah, or Jehoiakim. The general opinion, however, is, that the story is to be placed under Manasseh, and, as Calmet, Montfaucon, Prideaux, Whiston, and others will have it, after this monarch's return from Babylon. According to them, the events recorded in the book of Judith, and the collateral circumstances, occurred in the following order of time

	A.M.	B.C
Birth of Judith	3285	719
Manasseh begins to reign	3306	693
He is taken prisoner to Babylon and sent back to Judaea	3328	676
War between Nebuchadnezzar and Arphaxad	3347	657
Victory of Nebuchadnezzar over Arphaxad	3347	657
Expedition of Holofernes and siege of Bethulia	3348	656
Death of Manasseh	3361	643
Amon, his son, begins to reign	3361	643
Amon is murdered for his wickedness	3363	641
Josiah, his son, succeeds him, being eight years old	3363	641
Death of Judith, aged 105 years	3390	614
Battle of Megiddo and death of King Josiah	3394	610
The last siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar	3414	590
Destruction of Jerusalem and captivity of the Jews	3416	588

The Nebuchadnezzar of this book is, according to this theory, Saosduchinus, who succeeded his father Esarhaddon in the kingdom of Assyria and Babylon in the 31st year of Manasseh's reign, and Arphaxad is Deioces, king of Media. But this pre-exilian view again incurs the following objections:

(1.) It makes Judith to be *sixty-three* years old at the time when she is described as "a fair damsel" (ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ καλὴ) captivating Holofernes (12:13) and ravishing the hearts of many who desired to marry her (16:22). Calmet, however, is not disconcerted by supposing that Judith might in this case be sixty-three or sixty years old, "being then what we call a fine woman, and having an engaging air and person," "likely," adds Du Pin, "to charm an old general."

(2.) It is absolutely inconsistent with chap. 16:23, where we are expressly told that "there was none that made the children of Israel afraid in the days of Judith, nor a long time after her death." For even if we take the words "a long time after her death" to mean no more than twenty years, this would bring Judith's death to *twenty* years before the disastrous battle of Megiddo, wherein Josiah was mortally wounded, whereas this hypothesis places her death *only four* years before that calamitous event. This inconsistency is still more glaring according to the calculations of Prideaux, who maintains that Judith could not have been more than forty-five years of age when she captivated Holofernes, as this carries down her death to the 4th year of Zedekiah, when the state of the Jews had been exceedingly disturbed for several years by the Babylonians; and actually brings the period involved in the "long time after her death" beyond the total subversion of the Jewish state.

(3.) Judith affirms that there was no Jew to be found in any city who worshipped idolatry (8:17. 18), which is incompatible with the reign of Manasseh, Amon, and the first eight years of Josiah (comp. ~~14314~~2 Chronicles 33:14-17).

(4.) Holofernes, the chief officer of the Assyrian army, who had only recently invaded Judaea and taken Manasseh prisoner, must surely have known something about the Jews, yet he is described as being utterly ignorant of the very name of this Jewish monarch, as not knowing the people and the city of Jerusalem, and being obliged to ask for some information about them from the Amoritish chief (5:1-3).

(5.) The Jewish state is represented as being under the government of a high priest and a kind of Sanhedrim (6:6-14; 15:8), which is only compatible with *the post-exilian* period, when the Jews had no king

(6.) The book itself distinctly tells us in chap. 4:3, and 5:18, that the events transpired *after* the captivity, as is rightly interpreted by the compilers of

the marginal references of the A.V. who, on this passage, refer to ^{<1271>}2 Kings 25:9-11, and ^{<1500>}Ezra 1:1-3.

b. The difficulty of taking the book to record either pre-exilic or post-exilic history made Luther view it as "*a religious fiction or poem, written by a holy and ingenious man, who depicts therein the victory of the Jewish people over all their enemies, which God at all times most wonderfully vouchsafes.... Judith is the Jewish people, represented as a chaste and holy widow, which is always the character of God's people. Holofernes is the heathen, the godless or unchristian lord of all ages, while the city of Bethulia denotes a virgin*" indicating that the believing Jews of those days were the pure virgins" (*Vorrede aufs Buch Judith*). Some of the names can scarcely have been chosen without regard to their derivation (e.g. Achior = *Brother of Light*; Bethulia = **hyl wtb**, *the virgin of Jehovah*), and the historical difficulties of the person of Nebuchadnezzar disappear when he is regarded as the scriptural type of worldly power. Grotius, elaborating upon this idea, regards it as a parabolic description of Antiochus Epiphanes' assault on Judaea — "*Judith is the Jewish people (tydwhy); Bethulia is the Temple (hyl a tyb); the sword which went out of it, the prayers of the saints; Nebuchadnezzar signifies the devil; Assyria is pride, the devil's kingdom; Holofernes is the devil's instrument; (c̣j n rpl h lictor serpentis, minister diaboli); the widow is the helplessness of the Jewish people under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes; Joachim or Eliakim signifies God will arise (μωq hwwhyμωqy l a) to defend Judaea and cut off the instrument of the devil who would have her corrupted.*" Many of the modern writers who regard it as containing pure fiction call it either drama (Buddeus), epopee (Artropaeus, Moreus, Von Niebuhr, etc.), apologue (Babor), didactic poem (Jahn), moral fiction (Bauer), or romance (Berthold). Among the Roman Catholics this notion of an allegory is favored by Jahn, who maintains that the difficulties are otherwise insuperable. De Wette, however, considers that the fact of Holofernes being a historical name (together with other reasons) militates against the notion of an allegory, as maintained by Grotius. The name Holofernes is found in Appian (*In Syriac*. c. 47) and in Polybius (10:11). The latter, historian states that Holofernes, having conquered Cappadocia; lost it by endeavoring to change the customs of the country, and to introduce the drunken rites of Bacchus; and Casaubon (*ad-Athen.*) conjectures that this was the Holofernes of Judith. From its termination the name is supposed to

be of Persian extraction (compare *Orophernes*, Polybius, 33, 12); as Tisaphernes, Artaphernes, etc.

c. As the book itself, however, gives no intimation whatever that it is *a fiction or an allegory*, but, on the contrary, purports to be real history, as is evident from its minute geographical (1:7; 2:21.sq.; 3:9 sq.; 4:4, 6 sq.), historical (1:5 sq.), and chronological (1:13, 16; 8:4; 16:23) descriptions, Gutmann, Herzfeld, Keil, and others take it to contain a substance of truth embellished with fiction. This view is supported by the following facts:

1. Notwithstanding the arbitrary and uncritical manner in which the deuterocanonical historians dispose of their materials, they have always a certain amount of truth, around which they cluster the traditional embellishments.
2. A summary of the contents of Judith is given in the ancient Jewish prayers for the first and second Sabbaths of *the Feast of Dedication* — beginning with **בְּצֵטְוּ יְבִי תְּפִנָּאֲדָוָא** and **לֵאמֹר [יְצַוְמֵ יָא** — among the events which occurred in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and it cannot be supposed that the Jews would make it the basis of thanksgiving when the deliverance was never wrought, and the whole of it was nothing but a fiction.
3. There are ancient Midrashim which record the facts independently of the book of Judith. There is one, in particular, which gives a better recension of this book than either the Septuagint or the Vulgate, bears as much resemblance to the Septuagint and Vulgate as these two versions bear to each other, and removes many of the difficulties against its historical truthfulness, inasmuch as it begins with ch. 5:5, and thus shows that the Septuagint, from which the other versions were made, has put together two different records.

Those, however, who understand the book to be an allegorical representation of the Jewish people, widowed as to earthly resources, yet, by favor with God and man, prevailing over the powers of the world, do not thus relieve the fable from grave moral objections. An intelligent Jew, well read in the Hebrew Scriptures, could not have thought of setting up Judith as a proper embodiment of female heroism and Virtue. Her plan of procedure is marred throughout by hypocrisy and deceit; she even prays to God that he would prosper her deceit (9:12), and praises the cruelty of Simeon in slaying the Shechemites, as if his deed bore on it the sanction of

heaven, though Jacob; the father of Simeon, had consigned it in the name of God to eternal reprobation. The spirit of vengeance, resolute in its aim, unscrupulous in the means taken to accomplish it, is the pervading animus of the story — a spirit certainly opposed to the general teaching of Old as well as New Testament Scripture, and incapable of being embodied in a heroic story except by one who had much more regard for the political than the moral and religious elements in Judaism.

V. Author and Date. — The difference of opinion upon this subject is as great as it is upon the character of the book. It is not named either by Philo or Josephus; nor have we any indication whatever by which to form a conjecture respecting its author. But it has been supposed by some that it could not have been written by a contemporary, from the circumstance of the family of Achior being mentioned as still in existence, and of the festival of Judith being still celebrated. If this festival ever took place, it must have been of temporary duration, for, as Calmet observes, no record of it can be traced since the exile. Professor Alber, of Pesth, however, maintains that it is still recorded in the Jewish calendars. Jahn, after Grotius, refers the date of the book to the Maccabean period, and derives an argument for its late composition from the fact of the feast of the New Moon being mentioned (8:6, comp. with ~~4150~~ Mark 15:42). De Wette (*Einleitung*) conceives that the whole composition bespeaks an author who was a native of Palestine, who could not have lived beyond the end of the 1st century of the Christian era (the date assigned to it by Eichhorn), inasmuch as it is then cited by Clement of Rome, but that the probability is that it was much earlier written. Movers, a Roman Catholic professor at Bonn, a man of great penetration in similar investigations respecting the canonical books of the Old Testament, endeavors to fix the date; of its composition in the year B.C. 104. "The author," he observes, "who has transferred the geographical relations of his own time to a former period [see, however, Foster, *Geography of Arabia*, 1844, 1, 185], makes the Jewish territory commence at Scythopolis (2:10), and makes Bethulia, against which Holofernes directed his attack, the first Jewish city at the entrance into Judaea (4:7), reckoning the territory intervening between this and Samaria as tributary to the Jewish high priest. This state of affairs continued from the time of John Hyrcanus to Pompey's invasion of Judaea. Hyrcanus had seized upon Samaria, and wrested Scythopolis, with the surrounding territory, from Epicrates, the general of Ptolemy Lathurus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 10, 3), B.C. 110, according to Usher. But Samaria and

Scythopolis, with other acquisitions of the Maccabees, were lost forever to the Jewish nation when Pompey; B.C. 48, reduced Judaea to its ancient limits. The seacoast (3:1), independent of the Jews, continued, since the last years of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, to be a Jewish possession; but Carmel, which (1:8) was inhabited by the Gentiles, was still independent in the beginning of his reign, and he first seized it after the war with Ptolemy Lathyrus (13:15, 4)." It is to this war that Movers considers the book of Judith to refer, and he supposes it to have been written after the unfortunate battle at Asochis, in Galilee (or, rather, Asophen on the Jordan) (Movers, *Ueber die Ursprache der Deuteroksn. Bucher*, in the *Bonner Zeitschrift*, 13, 36 sq.). De Wette conceives that this hypothesis is opposed by the following geographical combinations:

1. Galilee belonged to the Asmonaeans, the proof of which, indeed, is by no means certain, while the following indications thereof present themselves:

(a) Asochis seems to have belonged to Alexander Jannaeus, as it received Ptolemy Lathyrus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 12, 4, comp. with 15, 4).

(b) Hyrcanus had his son Alexander Jannaeus brought up in Galilee (13:12, 1).

(c) Antigonus returned from Galilee (*War*, 1, 3, 3).

(d) Aristobulus seized upon Ituraea (*Ant.* 13, 11, 3), which presupposes the possession of Galilee.

(e) Even after the limits of Galilee were circumscribed by Pompey, it still belonged to the Jewish high priest (*War*, 1, 10 4).

2. Idumaea belonged to the Jewish state, but the sons of Esau came to Holofernes (7:8, 18).

3. If the author had the war with Ptolemy Lathyrus in view, the irruption of Holofernes would rather correspond with the movements of the Cyprian army, which proceeded from Asochis to Sepphoris, and thence to Asophen (*Einleitung*, § 307).

Wolff and others ascribe the authorship to Achior, B.C. 636-629; Huetius (in *Proep. Evang.* p. 217), Calmet (*Dissert. Proelim.* p. 142), etc., to Joshua, the son of Josedech, the companion of Zerubbabel, B.C. 536-515;

St. Jerome, etc., to Judith herself; Ewald, Vaihinger, etc., to the time of John Hyrcanus, B.C. 130-128; Volkmar, who takes it to be an allegorical description of the victory of the Parthians and Jews over Quietus, the delegate of Trajan, maintains (originally in the *Theol. Jahrbuch*. 1856, p. 362; and 1857, p. 448 sq.; afterwards in *Handb. d. Einl. in d. Apokr. Tub.* 1860) that it was written for the twelfth of Adar, A.D. 117-118, to commemorate this day (סְנַיִרְוֹפּוּיָא). He makes Nebuchadnezzar stand for Trajan, Nineveh for Antioch, Assyria for Syria, Arphaxad for the Parthians, Ecbatana for Nisibis, Holofernes for Lucius Quietus, and Judith for Judaea. This explanation assumes the spuriousness of the reference in the First Epistle of Clement (§ 6), which is too early for the date assigned. It has been adopted by Baur, Hitzig (in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 240 sq.), and Schenkel; but it is opposed by Hilgenfeld. (*ibid.* p. 270 sq.; 1861, p. 335 sq.), Lipsius (*ibid.* 1859, p. 39), and Ewald.

The fact, however, that, there are several records or recensions of the events contained in the book of Judith proceeding from different authors, and deviating materially from each other, precludes the possibility of ascertaining whose productions they are. All that can be said with certainty is that they all emanated from a Palestinian source. As the circumstances recorded are most plainly declared by the more trustworthy Hebrew copies, and in the Jewish prayers, to have occurred in the Maccabaeen struggles for independence (circa B.C. 170-160), the first and shortest record of them which was used for liturgical purposes must be contemporary with the events themselves. The poetical genius of the nation, however, soon embellished the facts in various ways, and hence the different recensions. The Greek version contained in the Septuagint must have been made at a much later period, since the author of it was already ignorant of the time when these circumstances occurred, and, as we have seen, mixed up two totally different records narrating events of different periods of the Jewish history.

VI. Canonicity of the Book. — Though the events recorded in Judith are incorporated in the hymnal service of the Jews called תּוֹרָאָה, yet the book itself was, never in the Jewish canon. The distinction, however, which the Jewish synagogue kept up between treating the book with respect and putting it into the canon could not be preserved in the Christian Church. Hence Judith, which was at first quoted with approbation by Clemens Romanus (Ep. c. 55), was gradually cited on an equality with other

Scripture by Clemenis Alexandrinus (*Strom.* 4), Tertullian (*De Monog.* c. 17), Ambrose (*De Offi. Minist.* 3, 13), and Augustine (*De Doctrinea Christianas*, 2, 8), and finally was canonized, in the councils of Carthage, by Innocent I of Rome, under Gelasius and of Trent. Some will have it that this book is quoted in the N.T. (comp. Judith 8, 4 sq., with ~~4020~~1 Corinthians 2:10 sq.; Judith 9:12 with ~~4024~~Acts 4:24; Judith 16:17 with Matt.: 12:42; 50). Judith, with the other deutero-canonical books, has been at all times read in the Church, and lessons are taken from it in the Church of England in course.

VII. Literature. — The three Midrashim in Jellinek's *Beth Ha-Midrash*, vols. 1 and 2 (Leipzig, 1853), Montfaucon, *La Verite de l'Histoire de Judith* (Paris, 1690) Hartmann, *Utrum Judditha contineat historiam* (Regiom. 1671); De Bonacasa, *Juditha ficta* (Veron. 1614) Artopoeus *Juditha Epopoea* (Strasb; 1694); Capellius, *Comment. et Notoe Crit. in V.T.* p. 459; Arnald, *The Apocrypha* in Patrick, Lowth, and Whitby's: *Comment.*; Du Pin, *History of the Canon* (Lond. 1699), 1, 10 sq., 90 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einleitung. in die Apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig, 1795), p. 291 sq.; Prideaux, *The Old and New Testaments connected* (ed. 1815), 1, 60 sq.; Whiston, *Sacred History of the Old and New Testament*, 1, 202; Reuss, in Ersch und Gruber's *Encyklopadie*, sec. 2, vol. 28, p. 98 sq.; Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Test.* (Lpzig. 1853), 2, 113 sq.; *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1856, p. 342 sq.; 1861, p. 421 sq.; Vaihinger, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 7, 135 sq.; Keil, *Einleitung in d. A.T.* (ed. 1859), p. 698; Diestel in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1862, p. 781 sq.; Lipsius, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 337 sq.

Express commentaries on this book alone have been written by Jos. Conzio, [tydWeyryva](#) (Asti, 1628, 16mo); Jeh. Low ben-Seeb, [tydWey tLjæ](#) (Vienna, 1799, 1819, 8vo); Frankel, [hydWShy](#) (Lpzig. 1830, 8vo); Is. Siebenberger, [tydWey tLjæ](#) (Warsaw, 1840, 8vo); Volkmar, *Das Busch Judith* (Tubing. 1860, 8vo); Wolff, *Das Buch Judith* (Leipzig, 1861, 8vo). **SEE APOCRYPHA.**

Judson, Adoniram

the senior Baptist missionary to Burmah, was born in Maiden, Mass., Aug. 9, 1788. He was the eldest son of Adoniram and Abigail Judson. Before he was ten years of age he had acquired a reputation as a superior student and

in 1807 graduated with the highest honors from Providence College (now Brown University), being not yet twenty years old. For a short period subsequently he was unsettled in his religious belief, but aroused by the death of an old classmate under peculiar circumstances, he became an earnest inquirer after the truth, and, though not a Christian, was admitted as a "special student" in the divinity school of Andover, and while there was converted, and joined the Congregational Church. In 1809 he declined a tutorship in Brown University, and in February, 1810, formed the resolution of becoming a missionary to the heathen. Several young men joined the seminary at this time who had also been for some time impressed with the need of missions to unchristian peoples. Judson became intimately associated with them, and their zeal finally led them to press this object on the attention of the American churches, and, though not properly the cause, they were the occasion of the formation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, who sent Mr. Judson to England to confer with the London Missionary Society as to the practicability of an affiliation between the societies and their joint operation in "foreign parts." Mr. Judson left America on this errand January 1, 1811, but on the way was captured by a privateering vessel, carried to France, and did not reach London till April 6, 1811. His mission failed in its primary object, but was of advantage to the cause of missions in America, for the American Board resolved to assume the responsibility of sending out its own missionaries. Mr. Judson, after marrying Ann Hasseltine; Feb. 5, 1812, embarked for India on the 19th of the same month, under the auspices of this new organization. Changing his views of baptism on the voyage, almost immediately after his arrival he sought immersion at the hands of Dr. Carey, the Baptist missionary at Serampore. The Baptists in America were already possessed of considerable missionary zeal and intelligence and, on learning of Dr. Judson's change of view, were roused to intense earnestness, and in 1814 they organized a denominational missionary society, and took Dr. Judson under their patronage. The hostility of the East India Company towards missionaries was at that time so intense, that within ten days after Judson's arrival in India he was peremptorily ordered to leave the country, and, being forced to comply, he took passage in a vessel for the Isle of France, Nov. 30, 1812. He subsequently returned to Madras, but, finding the East India Company uncompromising in their opposition, he departed for Burma, and reached Rangoon July 13, 1813. Accepting Burmah as his mission field, Mr. Judson addressed himself to the task of acquiring the language of that country, and not only attained to

the greatest familiarity with it, but spoke and wrote it with "the elegance of a cultured scholar." At an early period in these pursuits he published some "Grammatical Notices" of the language, which in a few short pages (only twenty-six) furnish "a most complete grammar of this difficult tongue." In imitation of the Burmese rest houses attached to their pagodas for the accommodation of pilgrims and worshippers, Mr. Judson instituted a *Zyat* in the public street for the reception of and conversation with inquirers about Christianity. This was ever a notable feature of his ministry, as he spent whole days thus with the people. Meeting with some success among the people, he resolved to go to Ava, the capital, and "lay his missionary designs before the throne, and solicit toleration for the Christian religion." His efforts were ineffectual, and he returned to Rangoon, and made a short trip to Calcutta for the recovery of Mrs. Judson's health. On July 20, 1822, Dr. Price, a newly arrived missionary physician, was summoned to attend on the king at Ava, and Mr. Judson was compelled to accompany him as interpreter. While at Ava Mr. Judson became known as the "Religion-propagating teacher," and, as his missionary prospects seemed favorable, though he went to Rangoon temporarily, he returned to Ava to prosecute his work. War breaking out between the British-India and the Burmese governments, all the foreigners at Ava came under suspicion as spies, and Mr. Judson, with others, was imprisoned. The horrible experiences of that incarceration cannot readily be described. On March 25, 1826, Mr. Judson himself wrote, "Through the kind interposition of our heavenly Father, our lives have been preserved in the most imminent danger from the hand of the executioner, and in repeated instances of most alarming illness during my protracted imprisonment of one year and five months; nine months in three pairs of fetters, two months in five, six months in one, and two months a prisoner at large." After his release he rendered most important service to the British government in the formation of the treaty at Yandabo; and later in a commercial treaty. While absent with the government embassy as interpreter, his first wife, one of the noblest of women, died. Mr. Judson shortly after (1827) returned from Ava and settled at Amherst, but subsequently removed to Maulmain, as events had made it a much more important post. From this time to 1834 he was variously employed in his mission work at Maulmain, Rangoon, Prome, and other places, and became interested in the Karens. (q.v.), among whom he made several missionary tours. In 1834 he married Mrs. Sarah Boardman, and completed his translation of the whole Bible into Burmese, in the revising. and perfecting of which, however, he spent sixteen years

more. This was the great work of his life and the best judges venture to hazard the opinion that three centuries hence Judson's Bible will be the Bible of the Christian Church of Burmah" (*Calcutta Review*, 14, 434). He also compiled a short Burmese and English dictionary. With a larger work of this kind he was occupied at the time of his death. In 1839-40 his health failed, and he was obliged to take several voyages for its recovery. In 1845, in consequence of the failing health of Mrs. Judson, he left for America. Mrs. Judson died at St. Helena, and Mr. Judson, continuing his voyage, reached Boston on October 15. He was received, in America "with affectionate and enthusiastic veneration that knew no bounds. His eminent position as the founder and pioneer of the mission; his long and successful labors in the East; his romantic and eventful life, associated with all that is most beautiful and lofty in human nature; his worldwide fame, and his recent afflictions, encircled him in the people's mind with the halo of an apostle." But Mr. Judson's heart was in Burmah. After marrying Miss Emily Chubbuck in June, 1846, he again set sail for India, and arrived at Rangoon on Nov. 30 of that year. His health, however, again declined, and he was obliged once more to resort to the sea for relief, but died on his way to the Isle of Bourbon, April 12, 1850, and was buried at sea. (J.T.G.)

Judson, Ann Hasseltine

was born at Bradford, Mass., Oct. 22, 1789. She was married to Adoniram Judson on Feb. 5, 1812, and was the first American woman to devote herself to foreign mission service. She became "intimately associated with her husband, in all his plans of benevolence, and bore an important part in their accomplishment" (Wayland's *Judson*, 1, 414), in 1824, in consequence of protracted ill health, leaving her husband in Burmah, she proceeded alone to America, where she remained, adding, however, much to the interest and advancement of missions by the publication of a very interesting account of the *history of the Burman Mission* in a series of letters to Mr. Butterworth, a member of Parliament, whose hospitality she enjoyed while in England, till 1823, when she rejoined her husband at Rangoon, and proceeded with him to Ava. It was during the trying scenes of the succeeding two years that her "devoted love, consummate tact, and heroic resolution were so manifest. Her whole time, with the exception of twenty days when she was confined by the birth of her child, was devoted to the alleviation of the sorrows of her husband and his fellow prisoners." She was perfectly familiar with the Burmese language, and possessed of a "presence which commanded respect even from savage barbarians, and

encircled her with a moral atmosphere in which she walked unharmed in the midst of a hostile city with no earthly protector" (Wayland, 1, 329). Her influence was acknowledged as contributing largely to the submission to the English terms of peace by the Burmese government. She died at Amherst on Oct. 24, 1826, during the absence of her husband, of disease which her sufferings and prostration at Ava had rendered her constitution incapable of resisting. "To great clearness of intellect, large powers of comprehension, and intuitive female sagacity, ripened by the constant necessity of independent action, she added that heroic disinterestedness which naturally loses all consciousness of self in the prosecution of a great object. These elements were, however, all held in reserve, and were hidden from public view by a veil of unusual feminine delicacy." (J.T.G.)

Judson, Emily Chubbuck

wife of Dr. Adoniram Judson, was born in Eaton, N.Y. Aug. 22, 1818. She contributed to the magazine literature of the country in early life under the assumed title of "Fanny Forester." She had contemplated becoming a missionary from early life, and marrying Dr. Judson June 2, 1846, she sailed with him from Boston for India, where she "employed all her strength in advancing the holy cause in which he was engaged." After his decease she was compelled, by reason of feeble health, to relinquish her mission work, and returned with her children to America. She rendered good service to Dr. Wayland in the preparation of his memoir of Dr. Judson. She died June 1, 1854. Her published works are, *Alderbrook; a collection of Fanny Forester's Village Sketches and Poems*" (Boston, 1846, 2 vols.); and the "Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Sarah B. Judson" quoted below. There are besides a goodly number of separate poems, of exquisite beauty of sentiment and of great pathos, of which we mention only *My Bird* and *The two Mammas*. See Wayland, *Life and Labors of Adoniram Judson* (Boston, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); *Calcutta Review*, vol. 14; *The Judson Offering*, edited by J. Dowling D.D. (New York, 1848), *Biographical Sketch of Sarah B. Judson*, by Mrs. Emily C. Judson (New York, 1849); Knowles, *Life of Mrs. Ann H. Judson*; Kendrick, *Life and Letters of Mrs. Emily C. Judson* (1801); Stuart, *Lives of Mrs. Ann H. Judson and Sarah B. Judson, with a Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Emily C. Judson* (1853). (J.T.G.)

Judson, Sarah Boardman

was born in Alstead, N.H., Nov. 4, 1803. She was the daughter of Ralph and Abia Hull, and was married to the Rev; George. D. Boardman in 1825 with whom she proceeded to Tavoy, Burmah, and in his missionary work shared great dangers and sufferings. Her husband died in 1831. Two of her children had previously died, and with one child, a son, left to her, she continued to prosecute her missionary work. In 1834 she married Dr. Judson, and in 1845, in consequence of failing health, she left Burmah for America, accompanied by her husband. On their arrival at St. Helena Mrs. Judson died, Sept. 1, 1845. She translated the New Testament and Burmese tracts into Peguan, and *Pilgrim's Progress* into Burmese. Of her a writer in the *Calcutta Review* says (vol. 14), "Exquisite sensibility, a poet's soul and imagination, great natural abilities, thorough unselfishness, and a woman's depth of love and affection, all shrouded by the most unpretending meekness and devotion, were some of the elements which blended together to form a character of extreme beauty." Her poem commencing "We part on this green islet, love," etc., is enough to entitle her to high praise as a poet. (J.T.G.)

Ju'el

(*Ἰουήλ*), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:34, 35) of two Heb. names:

- a. in the former verse UEL (^{<1510B>}Ezra 10:34);
- b. in the latter JOEL (^{<1510B>}Ezra 10:43).

Juennin, Gaspard,

a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Varenbon (Bresse) in 1650, entered the Oratory in 1674, and taught literature, philosophy, and theology in several schools of the congregation of the Oratory. He died in 1713. He deserves special recognition as a theological writer. His principal works are,

(1) *Commentarius Historicus et dogmaticus de Sacramentis* (Lyons, 1696, 2 vols. fol.). This work contains, besides the commentary, three dissertations on censures, irregularities, and indulgences, and deserves special notice for the fact that it is the first work of modern theologians treating at length the subject of the sacraments: —

(2) *Institutiones Theologicae* (Lyons, 1696, 4 vols. 12mo, and often), which was used for some time as a text book of theology in several Roman Catholic institutions; a revised edition, expunging some objectionable views, was prepared by Juennin in 1705, and the work continued in use. In 1708 he published an abridgment of it as a *Compendium Theologiae* (Paris, 1708, 12mo). He also published a separate treatise on the sacraments, *Theorie et pratique des Sacraments* (Paris, 1713, 3 vols. 12mo), which is valuable. See Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* 6,367.

Juggernaut

SEE JAGGERNAUT.

Jugglers

a word brought into English from the mediaeval Latin *joculator* (in *Provençal joglar, joglador*; in old *French jonglere* or *jonglier*), through the modern French *jongleur*, and originally used to designate the professional musicians who attended the Troubadors and Trouveres of Provence and the north of France, either singing their poems, or, if they sung them themselves, accompanying them with an instrument, which was reckoned beneath the dignity of the poet himself. This profession was in the Middle Ages (from the 11th to the 15th century) an honorable one, but it gradually died out, or at least lost its respectability, and jugglers became a term for rope dancers, and all that class of persons who sought to gratify the populace by sleight of hand or feats of agility, until in our own day, finally, it has come to be used as a synonym of *conjuror*, and is applied to persons who perform tricks of *legerdemain* (q.v.). SEE EXORCISM; SEE SORCERY.

Jugulum.

SEE TRANSENNA.

Juice

(*systeme* *asis*'), as freshly trodden from grapes), new wine (as rendered ²³⁴⁵Isaiah 49:26, etc.); hence fermented liquor of pomegranates (^{218D}Song of Solomon 8:2). SEE WINE.

Jukes, Charles,

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, native of England (1788), was converted in 1812, and joined the Church of St. Neots, Nottinghamshire, under the ministry of Rev. Thomas Morall. Filled with pious zeal, he began to preach as a layman, with great acceptance, among the destitute villages within twenty miles of his home; subsequently he entered the ministry, and came to this country in 1830. On his way to Canada, on the day boat to Albany, he preached, at the request of passengers, a sermon from the words "There is a God in heaven who revealeth secrets;" and, at the urgent request of a plain farmer, who was not a professing Christian, he turned aside to preach to two churches in Saratoga County, N.Y., to which he was at once called. He was settled successively in Presbyterian and Reformed churches at Edinburgh and Fish House, Amsterdam, Glen and Auriesville, Stone Arabia and Ephratah, and at Rotterdam, all in N.Y. He died at the latter place in 1862. At Glen about seventy persons united with the Church during the four years of his pastorate. His great characteristic was his untiring zeal and earnestness. He was a bold, catholic, evangelical preacher of righteousness, an excellent pastor, and a very exemplary and useful servant of the Lord. His temperament was peculiarly happy; his Christian experience large and varied; his death peaceful and triumphant. See Corning, *Manual of the Ref. Ch.; Personal Recollections.* (W.J.R.T.)

Jul

the name of Christmas among the northern tribes of Europe. Originally it was the name of the old Scandinavian festival of winter solstice, but as the practices of that festival have in the main been incorporated in the Christmas feast, they term it *Jul*. **SEE JULES.**

Jules

are aerial spirits and daemons among the northern tribes, especially the Laplanders, to whom divine adoration is paid. They suppose them to dwell under particular trees, and proceed thither to offer up sacrifices once a year, at Christmas time, whence the name of the Christian festival corresponds to their *Jul* (q.v.). See Broughton, *Biblioth. hist. Sacra*, s.v.; Thorpe. *Northern Mythol.* 2, 49 sq.

Ju'lia

(*Ιουλία*, fem. of *Julius*), a Christian woman of Rome, to whom Paul sent his salutations (⁴⁵¹⁶⁵Romans 16:15); she is named with Philologus, and is supposed to have been his wife or sister. A.D. 55. — Kitto. "Origen supposes that they were master and mistress of a Christian household which included, the other persons mentioned in the same verse. Some modern critics have conjectured that the name may be that of a man, *Julias*"

Julian The Apostate

emperor of Rome A.D. 361-363, is especially celebrated by his able and vigorous, but vain attempt to dethrone Christianity, and to restore the ancient Graeco-Roman paganism in the Roman Empire to its former power and glory. He was the nephew of Constantine the Great, the first Christian on the throne of the Caesars, and was educated under the restraining influence of the court Christianity of his cousin, the Arian emperor Constantius. The austere, monastic, intolerant, tyrannical, and hypocritical form of this belief repelled the independent youth, and made him a bitter enemy of Christianity, and an enthusiastic admirer of the heathen poets and philosophers, whose writings, in spite of the severe prohibition, he managed secretly to procure and to study, especially during his sojourn at the University of Athens. "The Arian pseudo-Christianity of Constantius produced the heathen anti-Christianity of Julian, and the latter was a well deserved punishment of the former." But he shrewdly concealed his real convictions. and hypocritically conformed to all the outward rites of Christianity till the death of the emperor. His heathenism was not a simple, spontaneous growth, but an artificial and morbid production. It was the heathenism of pantheistic eclecticism and Neo-Platonism, a strange, mixture of philosophy, poesy, and superstition, and, in Julian at least, in great part an imitation or caricature of Christianity. With all his philosophical intelligence, he credited the most insipid legends of the gods, or gave them a deeper mystic meaning by the most arbitrary allegorical interpretation. He was in intimate personal intercourse with Jupiter, Minerva, Apollo, Hercules, who paid their nocturnal visits to his heated fancy, and assured him of their special favor and protection. His moral character corresponded to this pseudo-philosophy. He was full of affectation, vanity, sophistry, loquacity, and dissimulation, Everything he said, or wrote, or did was studied and calculated for effect. His apostasy from Christianity Julian dates from his twentieth year, A.D. 351. But while

Constantius lived he concealed his pagan sympathies with consummate hypocrisy for ten years, and outwardly conformed to all the rites of the Church. After December, 355, he suddenly surprised the world with brilliant military successes and executive powers as Caesar in Gaul, which was at that time threatened by barbarians, and won the enthusiastic love of his soldiers. Now he raised the standard of rebellion against his imperial cousin, and in 361 openly declared himself a friend of the gods. By the sudden death of Constantius in the same year he became sole emperor, and made his triumphal entry into Constantinople. He immediately set to work with the utmost zeal to reorganize all departments of the government on the former heathen basis. He displayed extraordinary talent, industry, and executive tact. The eighteen short months of his reign (Dec. 361-June 363) comprehend the plans of life long administration. He was the most gifted, the most learned and most active, and yet the least successful of Roman emperors. His reign was an utter failure, teaching the important lesson that it is useless to swim against the stream of history and to impede the Onward march of Christianity. He proved beyond the possibility of doubt, that paganism had outlived itself, and that Christianity was the only living religion which had truly conquered the world, and carried all the hopes of humanity. He died in the midst of his plans in a campaign against Persia, characteristically exclaiming (according to later tradition), "Galilæan, thou hast conquered!"

Picture for Julian

Julian did not resort to open violence in his attempt to destroy Christianity in the empire. He affected the policy of philosophical toleration. He did not wish to give the Christians an additional glory of martyrdom. He hoped to attain his end more surely in an indirect way. He endeavored to revive heathenism by his own personal zeal for the worship of the gods. But his zeal found no echo, and only made him ridiculous in the eyes of the cultivated heathen themselves. When he endeavored to restore the oracle of Apollo near Antioch, and arranged for a magnificent display, only a solitary priest appeared in the temple and ominously offered — a goose. He also attempted to reform heathenism by incorporating with it the morals and benevolent institutions of Christianity. But this was like galvanizing a decaying corpse, or grafting fresh scions on a dead trunk. As to the negative part of his assault upon Christianity, Julian gave liberty to all the sects, in the hope that they might devour each other, but, instead of that, he only gave new vigor to the cause he hated. He forbade the Christians to

read the classical authors, and deprived them of the benefit of schools of their own, that they might either grow up in ignorance, or be forced get an education from heathen teachers. He assisted the Jews in rebuilding the Temple of Jerusalem in order to falsify the prophecy of Christ, but the attempt, three times repeated, signally failed, by an interposition of Providence approaching to the character of a miracle. (Respecting this question, see the judicious remarks in Lardner's *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, vol. 4.) Finally he wrote a book against Christianity, in which he united all the arguments of Porphyry, Celsus, Lucian, and other enemies before him, and infused into them his own bitter and sarcastic spirit. But this attack called forth able refutations from Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyril of Alexandria, and others, and contains a number of incidental admissions which confirm the truth of most of the leading facts of the Gospel history. Dr. Lardner (in his learned book on *the Credibility of the Gospel History*, in the London edition of his works by Kippis, 7, 638-639) thus sums up the involuntary testimony of this ablest and bitterest of all the heathen opponents of Christianity:

"Julian has borne a valuable testimony to the history and to the books of the New Testament. He allows that Jesus was born in the reign of Augustus, at the time of the taxing made in Judaea by Cyrenius; that the Christian religion had its rise, and began to be propagated, in the times of the emperors Tiberius and Claudius. He bears witness to the genuineness and authenticity of the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Acts of the Apostles; and he so quotes them as to intimate that they were the only historical books received by Christians as of authority, and the only authentic memoirs of Jesus Christ and his apostles, and the doctrines preached by them. He allows their early date, and even argues for it. He also quotes, or plainly refers to, the Acts of the Apostles, to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians. He does not deny the miracles of Jesus Christ, but allows him to have 'healed the blind, and the lame, and daemioniacs;' and to have rebuked the winds, and walked upon the waves of the sea.' He endeavors, indeed, to diminish these works, but in vain. The consequence is undeniable such works are good proofs of a divine mission. He endeavors also to lessen the number of the early believers in Jesus, and yet he acknowledges that there were 'multitudes of such men in Greece and Italy' before St. John wrote

his Gospel. He likewise affects to diminish the quality of the early believers, and yet acknowledges that, besides men servants and maid servants, 'Cornelius, a Roman centurion at Caesarea, and Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus, were converted to the faith of Jesus before the end of the reign of Claudius. And he often speaks with great indignation of Peter and Paul, those two great apostles of Jesus, and successful preachers of his Gospel; so that, upon the whole, he has undesignedly borne testimony to the truth of many things recorded in the books of the New Testament. He aimed to overthrow the Christian religion, but has confirmed it: his arguments against it are perfectly harmless, and insufficient to unsettle the weakest Christian. He justly excepts to some things introduced into the Christian profession by the hate professors of it, in his own time or sooner, but has not made one objection of moment against the Christian religion as contained in the genuine and authentic books of the New Testament."

Literature. — Juliani Imperatoris Opera quae supersunt omnia (ed. by Petavius, Par. 1583, and more completely by E. Spanheim, Lips. 1696, 2 vols. fol.); Cyril of Alexandria *Contra impium Jul. librix* (which contains the chief argument of Julian against Christianity, with their refutation), in Cyril's *Opera*, ed. Aubert, tom. 6, and in Spanheim's edition of Julian's works. Also the relevant sections in the heathen historians Ammianus Marcellinus, Zosimus, and Eunapius, and in the Church histories of Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret. Among modern writers on Julian we refer to Tillemont, *Memoires*, etc., 7, 322-420; Warburton, *Julian* (London, 1751); Neander, *Julian and sein Zeitalter* (Leipz. 1812; in an English dress, N.Y. 1850, 12mo); Joudot, *Histoire de l'empereur Julien* (1817, 2 vols.); Wiggers, *Julian der Abtrunnige* (Leipzig, 1837); Teuffel, *De Juliano religionis Christiani contemptore* (Tub. 1844); Fr. Strauss, *Der Romantiker auf dem Thron der Coesaren, oder Julian der Abtrunnige* (Manheim, 1847); Schaff; *Ch. Hist.* 2, 40 sq.

Julian Of Eclanum.

SEE PELAGIUS; SEE PELAGIANS.

Julian Of Halicarnassus,

the bishop celebrated as the leader of a faction of the Monophysites, who bear his name, flourished in the early part of the 6th century. When the

Monophysite bishops were deposed in 519 he was obliged to flee to Alexandria for safety. For further details, *SEE MONOPHYSITES*.

Julian, St.

SEE POMERIUS.

Julian Of Toledo.

SEE TOLEDO, COUNCILS OF (14TH); SEE SPAIN.

Julian(Us) Cesarini, Cardinal,

one of the most distinguished characters of the Church of Rome in the Middle Ages prominently connected with the efforts to heal the dissensions within the pale of the Romish Church of the 15th century, and the union of the Eastern and Western churches at the Council of Florence; was born at Rome in 1398, the descendant of a noble family noted in the annals of Italian history. He was educated at the University of Perugia, and early evinced the possession of great ability and uncommon talents. He particularly interested himself in the study of the Roman law, and soon acquired the reputation of being one of the foremost thinkers, and was honored with a professor's chair at Padua. He was not suffered, however, to continue long in the rostrum, for the Church of his day needed men of decision and energy to allay the strife which was raging fiercely, and threatening the destruction of the hierarchical edifice so lately dishonored in the occupation of the papal chair by licentious characters. sometimes familiarly termed the Babylonish captivity of the Church of Rome, the illustrious Colonna, better known as Martin V, was to obliterate, as well as to rebuild on a firm foundation both the moral and material influence of the papacy. For such a task his own talents, however great, were not sufficient, and the wise, far seeing pontiff was not slow to recognize the uncommon endowments of young Julian, who was accordingly appointed apostolic prothonotary, and, later, auditor of the Rota Romana. Cardinal Brunda in particular became interested in the rising Cesarinus; and when, in 1419, he was sent as papal legate to Bohemia to bring back the erring (?) sheep of the Slavonic fold, Julian was the legate's companion and mainstay. Though this mission failed to accomplish its objects, at the Diet of Brunn, Julian won golden opinions from the Romans, and in 1426 (May 22) was promoted to the cardinalate of Santo Angelo. When, in 1431, a diet was summoned at Nuremberg "to concert immediate and vigorous action for

crushing the hitherto successful rebellion," it was none other than cardinal Julian whom Martin V selected (after his death confirmed by Eugenius IV) to represent him in that ecclesiastical body, as well as in the general council which, in accordance with the celebrated decree "*Frequens*" of the Council of Constance, was soon to meet at Basle. It had been determined to extirpate the Hussites by all means. As kind words would not bring them back to the open arms of the Church the cardinal legate boldly exchanged the mitre for the helmet. Quickly an army of Crusaders was gathered, and in himself blending together the characters of the priest and the soldier he sought to kindle in their hearts the fires of religious zeal and patriotic devotion. But neither the potency of a blessed banner and a consecrated sword nor the spectacle of an ecclesiastic urging on an army to a war of faith, had sufficiently impressed Rome's most faithful adherents to brave "The face of a religious influence like that of Hussitism, which was rooted in national sympathies, such as Rome could never awaken in the day of her greatest power," and ignominiously the papal legate again failed in his mission. Meanwhile, however, the Council of Basle had convened, opened in the absence of the legate by two of his deputies, and thither Julian directed his steps. He assumed its presidency Sept. 9, 1431, determined by peaceful measures to essay once more the accomplishment of a task which he had found it impossible to secure on the field of battle; and to his honor be it said that all the inducements which were now held out to the Hussites were the offerings of a sincere and pious soul, which desired above all things else the glory of God and the honor of his Church. "The sanguine and undaunted legate, who had been the first to reckon on the military campaign as the only remedy for the spreading disease; was now the first to fall back upon the council from which he had hitherto augured so little good. 'As I saw no other remedy left' (are his own words), I animated and encouraged all to remain steadfast in the faith, and to fear nothing, since on this very account I was going to the council where the whole Church would assemble'" (Jenkins). How much Julian did to obtain Eugenius' sanction to the continuation of the council which that pontiff was determined to abrogate, and how Julian, notwithstanding the publication of a bull abrogating the council, and convoking it eighteen months later at Bologna continued the session, and with what liberality sagacity he counseled in the deliberations of this synod, and with what earnestness and zeal he defended the independence of the council and its superiority over the pontiff we have already mentioned in the article on *SEE BASLE, COUNCIL OF* (q.v.). Suffice it to say that, had the wise and all seeing

policy of the legate been allowed to be carried out in the name and with the full consent of the Roman pontiff, the Hussites would have been redeemed and the Church of Rome been spared the reductions which she suffered in the 16th century, and which even now threaten her very existence. *SEE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH*. Annoyed and distracted by the opposition of Eugenius, the president hardly knew how to dispose of the Bohemian question, and the Hussites, doubting the sincerity of the cardinal, received every advance with distrust, and misinterpreted every utterance of Julian; till it finally became evident to both parties that their mission was fruitless, and that it had only opened another and a still more intricate chapter in the history of this long and eventful controversy. *SEE HUSSITES*. But if Julian had battled for reform within the Church, and had boldly argued in favor of the council's supremacy over the incumbent of the papal chair, he had yet faithfully adhered to the Roman pontificate; and when, as he believed, the fathers of the Church determined to deprive Eugenius of a portion of his support, he as earnestly defended the pontiff's cause, and suddenly the council found itself at variance with its able president, and the Church threatened with a greater schism than she had ever yet endured. It is true Julian had been one of the prime and most zealous leaders in abolishing the annates (q.v.), but he staunchly insisted with the same zeal for some compensation from other sources; and when he found the council indisposed to meet his views, he quickly changed front, and became one of Eugenius' most outspoken adherents. The breach had opened in February 1437; in September, the arrival of a papal bull ordering a synod at Ferrara to consider the question of uniting the Eastern and Western churches obliged Julian to resign the presidency, and on Jan. 9, 1438, he quitted Basle, and, after a short visit to Rome, hastened to Ferrara. *SEE FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF; SEE FELIX V*. This sudden change of Julian from an opponent to an adherent of the Eugenic party has led historians to doubt the sincerity of the cardinal; but when we consider that Julian's great object was the union of the Eastern and Western churches, the healing of schisms within either, and a thorough reformation to suit the wants of the day, this action explains itself to us as really the natural development of those great principles of ecclesiastical policy upon which Julian had acted from the beginning; and "while the advocates of the pope were rejoicing over the immediate fruits of a successful duplicity, that vigorous and impulsive mind, which had guided the intellectual strength of Christendom in the freest and most enlightened council that had assembled since the apostolic age, was preparing itself for a future of more enduring

triumph. The long and dreary night of schisms and controversies seemed now far spent, and the day of strength and reunion was at hand. How sublime was the prospect now opening upon an earnest and sanguine mind. The restoration of the Church to its first beauty and integrity; its reformation by the recovery of its first estate, and of that spirit which made it one in Christ; the overthrow of the infidel and the enemy of the Church by a warfare of whose glories the earlier Crusades would become but a faint prophecy; the extension of the power of the papacy over all Christendom, and the restoration of the episcopacy to its pristine beauty under the one universal patriarch — these were the most prominent features of this vision of things to come. We cannot wonder that, with such a view before him the great reformer of the Church at Basle laid down the work of reformation to take up that of union; and while keeping still, as the rule of all his labors, the truth proclaimed at Constance, "There can be no real union without reformation, nor true reformation without union," he fell back upon the work of union when that of reformation became impossible. To one who regards his course from this point every stage of his transition from Basle to Florence will become clear and consistent. Everywhere we shall recognize a careful provision for the exigencies of the Church, formed from the matured experience of its past dangers, and a disinterested zeal which, in an age of selfish intrigue, was as naturally misrepresented as it was willfully misunderstood. The insinuation of Gibbon is at once confronted by the fact that if Julian had not sought the peace of the Church rather than his own aggrandizement, he might have grasped at this moment the papacy itself, and wrested from Eugenius that authority under which he was content to close a life of brilliant but ill requited service" (Jenkins, p. 266-268).

But if the conduct of Julian had hitherto been the outgrowth of a sincere heart, we can only look with suspicion upon his actions in the Council of Florence, removed thither from Ferrara. His name deserves to be treated with ignominy for the duplicity he manifested towards the leading prelates of the Eastern Church, and from this time dates the earliest "moral declension in the course of Julian, which was at once closed and expiated in the dark page of the Hungarian legation." *SEE FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF; SEE PURGATORY; SEE FILIOQUE; SEE JOSEPH OF CONSTANTINOPLE*. For his valuable services to the papacy, Eugenius bestowed on him the bishopric of Frascati, and in 1443 further evinced his recognition of Julian's efforts by appointing him legate to Hungary, which

country, the very bulwark against further advances of the Turks, was at this time threatened by civil dissensions, and was fast developing many causes of as serious apprehensions to the court of Rome as Bohemia had done in the previous century. *SEE SIGISMUND; SEE WLADISLAS*. Again Julian was obliged to lay aside his spiritual weapons, and to draw the temporal sword which he had once before wielded so unsuccessfully. But not only did he change the manner and weapons of warfare, but even the principles for which he fought; and hereafter Julian is marked by an *unscrupulous* pursuit of his object, and it becomes really difficult to detect, under the strange disguise which he henceforth assumes "the features of that enlightened mind which inspired the decrees and directed the correspondence of the Council of Basle." His task was to heal the dissensions of the Hungarian royalty, and to enlist that country, in union with all the rest of Christendom, to check the further advance, and, if possible, bring about the utter annihilation of the Turks; and when the sudden death of the queen regent Elizabeth (which is oftentimes said to have been *caused* by Julian Cesarinus) and the accession of Wladislas had secured to the Turks a peace of ten years, it was Julian who came forward to argue with the king on the fallacy of adhering to a compact with heretics, especially as the treaty had been made without the sanction of the holy see. The apostolic authority served to free Wladislas from his obligation, and the war with the Saracens began anew, in which both king and papal legate fell a prey to Mohammedan defenders at the battle of Varna (1440). According to some, Julian was murdered in his flight by a Wallachian who saw gold on his clothes; others say that the Hungarians killed him in punishment for his evil advice; while others, again, say that he died in 1446, in consequence of a wound received while leading on the Christians; and some Romish historians even claim that he suffered martyrdom in the camp of the Turks; but as none of the contemporary historians knew anything of the kind to have occurred, it seems useless to refute the statement. His speeches are contained in the Acts of Councils, and his two letters to Eugenius concerning the Council of Basle in the *Fasciculus rerum expetend.* (Col. 1535), p. 27 sq. See Jenkins *Life and Times of Cardinal Julian* (London, 1861, 8vo); Hefele, *Quartalschrift*, 1847, 2; Cave, *Scriptores Ecclesiastes*; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, 32, 11 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity* (see Index in vol. 8). (J.H.W.)

Julian Calendar.

SEE CALENDAR, ROMAN.

Julian Cross, Or Cross Of St. Julian,

is the name of a crosslet placed saltire ways. *SEE CROSS.*

Julian Epoch; Julian Year.

SEE CHRONOLOGY, CHRISTIAN.

Juliana, St.

SEE CORPUS CHRISTI.

Julianists.

SEE JULIAN OF HALICARNASSUS.

Juliano

a Spanish Roman Catholic of the 17th century, who, while traveling in Germany, was converted to the Protestant faith. His zeal for the diffusion of the Word of God led him to undertake the dangerous enterprise of conveying into Spain a large quantity of Bibles concealed in casks, and packed up as Rhenish wine. A pretended Protestant betrayed him. He was seized by the Inquisition, and, together with eight hundred purchasers of his precious treasure, was condemned to the torture and to death. — Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 136.

Julias

Picture for Julias

the name given by Philip the Tetrarch to Bethsaida in honor of Julia, the daughter of the emperor Augustus. *SEE BETHSAIDA.*

Julitta Of Cappadocia,

a female martyr of the 4th century, under Diocletian, was a Lycaonian of royal descent, and greatly celebrated for her Christian virtues. To avoid the bigoted rage of the pagan governor, she withdrew from Iconium, her native city, to Tarsus. But here, with her young son Cyricus, she was seized, and, confessing herself a Christian, was ordered to the rack. Her beautiful boy, for repeating his mother's words, "I am a Christian," was dashed in pieces on the pavement before her eyes, for which the dying mother gave thanks

to God. After patiently suffering various torments, she was beheaded, April 16, A.D. 305. — Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 55.

Ju'lius

(**Ιούλιος**, for the Latin *Julius*, the name of an honorable Roman family), the centurion of the imperial cohort who had the charge of conducting Paul as a prisoner to Rome, and who treated him with much consideration and kindness on the way (^{<4270>}Acts 27:1, 3, 43; comp. ver. 11, 31). A.D. 55. — Kitto. "Augustus's band," to which Julius belonged, has been identified by some commentators with the Italian band (^{<4800>}Acts 10:1); by others, less probably, with the body of cavalry denominated Sebasteni by Josephus (*Ant.* 19, 9, 2, etc.). Conybeare and Howson (*Life of St. Paul*, ch. 21) adopt in the main Wieseler's opinion, that the Augustan cohort was a detachment of the Praetorian Guards attached to the person of the Roman governor at Caesarea; and that this Julius may be the same as Julius Priscus (Tacitus, *Hist.* 2, 92; 4, 11), sometime centurion, afterwards prefect of the Praetorians. *SEE ITALIAN*; *SEE PAUL*.

Julius

a Christian martyr, was a Roman senator in the 2d century. A convert to Christianity, he was ordered by the emperor to sacrifice to him as Hercules. This Julius absolutely refused to do, and he was imprisoned, and finally beaten to death with clubs. — Fox, *Book of Martyrs*. p. 22.

Julius Africanus,

an ecclesiastical writer who flourished In the beginning of the 3d century, was, according to Suidas (s.v. Africanus), a native of Libya, but resided generally at Emmaus (afterwards Nicopolis), in Palestine. The same writer calls him also *Sextus*. Little is known of his personal history. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 6, 31) relates that he undertook a journey to Alexandria to listen to Heraclas, the teacher of the catechumens in that city, as also that he was sent by the inhabitants of Emmaus to ask of the emperor Heliogabalus the restoration of their city, which was granted (see Jerome, *De vir. illustr.* c. 63). He was a friend of Origen; and as, in letters addressed to him when the latter was already some fifty years old, he styles him "son," it is to be supposed that he was much advanced in years in 238, while the expression "colleague" seems to imply that he was also a priest. He was, according to Jerome, in the full vigor of life during the reign of

Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus. We have no information concerning the precise date of his death; it occurred, in all probability, near the middle of the 3d century — some say about A.D. 232. He enjoyed great reputation for learning among the ancients. He is the author of the oldest Christian history of the world, the *Chronographia, or De temporibus*, which Eusebius considered very trustworthy: it extended from the creation to the third year of the reign of Heliogabalus (221). Unfortunately, the complete work is not in our possession; a portion, however, was preserved to us by copious extracts, which subsequent Church historians made from it, and these (fifty-six fragments) have been collected by Galland (*Bibliotheca*, vol. 2). Julius also wrote a letter to Origen concerning the authenticity of the history of Susannah and the Elders, and another to Aristides on the differences between the genealogies of Christ by Matthew and Luke. In this last letter, speaking against the opinion of a *fraus pia* having been perpetrated by the Church in order to prove the rights of Jesus as high priest and king, he says, "Far be it that such a thought should govern the Church of Christ as to invent a falsehood to glorify Christ." Eusebius, Photius, and Suidas ascribe to him also the authorship of another work in twenty-four books, a sort of compendium of information on medicine and natural philosophy. According to Suidas, it was a collection of empiric formulas for curing diseases by sorcery, etc. But, as this does not seem to agree with what we know of the general character of the man, Dupin thinks that there must be some mistake, and that there probably existed both a Julius Africanus and a Julius Sextus, who have been confounded one with the other. Finally, he has also been considered the author of several treatises — *De trinitate, De circumcissione, De Attalo, De Pascha, De Sabbate* — which are evidently not his, but belong to the Roman presbyter Novatian. See Möhler, *Patrologie*, 1, 577-580; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* 2, 108 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 7, 155.

Julius Caesar,

Picture for Julius

the first emperor of the Romans, deserves a place in our work on account of his connection with Jewish history. He was born at Rome, July 12, B.C. 100, and was educated in Greece, whither the Roman youths of his day were wont to resort for instruction. After having successively held the offices of tribune, quaestor, aedile, high priest, and praetor or governor of Spain, Caesar was one of the three parties who constituted the triumvirate

of Rome, B.C. 60. He now set out for (Gaul, ostensibly aiming at the subjugation of the Gauls, but actually to form and discipline an army that might enable him to force his coadjutors to leave to him alone the government of the Romans. The success with which his efforts, both as a soldier and a politician, were rewarded, are known to us from the history of the Gallic War that flowed from his own pen, as well as from other distinguished classic historians. When he went to Gaul he was to remain there five years, but the expiration of that time finding him involved in wars with the barbarians, five years more were added. Germany; Britain, and other countries also were invaded in turn; and when, at the death of Crassus, Caesar and Pompey alone were left to contend for supremacy, a quarrel naturally enough arose between the two rivals. Pompey was the favorite of the people, and therefore easily controlled the senate; if only once Caesar could be obliged to disband the army, as whose hero the victorious general of the Gallic wars was worshipped there could be no longer any need for contention, and Pompey alone would be intrusted with the responsibility of the Roman government. A decree was quickly passed by the Roman senate commanding Caesar to disband his forces; but Caesar not only refused to comply with the demand, but actually marched against Pompey, whom he soon drove from Rome, and in the Eternal City, B.C. 49, was made dictator. Of the pursuit of Pompey and the fate of the latter we need not speak here; but the noble conduct of the Roman general towards his fallen enemy and towards his assassins is so meritorious in its character, that it deserves at least, in passing, a Christian commendation. When the news of the death of Pompey reached Rome, Caesar was again appointed dictator for one year and consul for five years, and was invested with tribunicial power for life. His adherence to the cause of Cleopatra led him to enter Egypt and to engage in the "Alexandrine war," which also he brought to a successful termination in March, B.C. 47. In September of this year he returned to Rome, and was once more appointed dictator. But with the death of Pompey his partisans had by no means vanished. It is true that they had quitted Rome, but in Africa they were still dutiful to the memory and principles of their late master. To Africa, therefore, Caesar directed his steps; the party of Pompey was quickly attacked and subdued. The feud of Metellus, of Scipio, of Cato, and Juba was sad indeed, but the display of noble and wise generosity which Caesar now displayed towards those arrayed in arms against him proves him "to have been possessed of a great, magnanimous nature. He was not a man that could stoop to the vulgar atrocities of Marius or Sulla, and so he majestically declared that

henceforth he had no enemies, and that hereafter he would make no difference between Pompeians and Caesareans." Returned to Rome, he celebrated his victories in Gaul, Egypt, Pontus, and Africa by four great triumphs, during which the whole Roman populace was feasted and feted by his magnificent liberality. But the display in which Caesar indulged soon led the Romans to fear that he aimed higher than the dictatorship — that absolute government was his object. Roman patriotism had not yet expired. Many there were in the Eternal City in whose veins flowed republican blood, and the man who dared to conspire to deprive them of the liberties they had so long enjoyed was doomed to fall at their hands. His death seemed the only surety of the continuation of their long enjoyed privileges of a free and untrammelled government. While Caesar was planning how soonest to wear the insignia of royalty, Brutus and other senators were sharpening their weapons to take his life. On the fifteenth of March, B.C. 44. after Caesar had taken his accustomed scat in the senate at the Capitol, a friend gave him a paper containing an account of the conspiracy against his life, but, while yet holding it in his hand, the conspirators themselves crowded around him, and at a given signal their daggers pierced his breast, and Rome was visited by the greatest disaster that could have befallen her at this time. To secular works belongs a reference to the writings of this remarkable character. For his reformation of the calendar, *SEE CALENDAR, ROMAN*. By the ecclesiastical writer Caesar deserves notice for his kind enactments in behalf of the Jews, and generous treatment of them. From this people he had received valuable assistance during his campaign in Egypt, and Caesar always preserved a grateful recollection of Antipater and his brethren. In Egypt he confirmed all the privileges the Jews had previously enjoyed. In Judaea more favorable laws were enacted; Antipater was appointed lieutenant of the country, with the honored title of a Roman citizen; Hyrcanus was confirmed in the priesthood, and provision was made for the fortification of the Holy City and the repair of its walls. See Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, bk. 14, chap. 8, sq.; Strabo, *Geography* (Bohn's ed.), 3, 184. *SEE CAESAR*. (J.H.W.)

Julius Echter.

SEE MESPELBRUNN.

Julius Henry

duke of Brunswick, deserves our notice on account of his identification with the Reform movement of the 16th century. He was born July 10, 1538, and was originally designed for the clerical office, but in 1568 he succeeded his father, and at once introduced the religion of the Reformers, for which he had early manifested a strong inclination. In 1576 he founded the University of Helmstedt. He died May 3, 1589.

Julius Maternus.

SEE FIRMICUS.

Julius I, Pope,

a native of Rome, succeeded Marcus († Oct. 7, 336) on the 6th of Feb. 337, after the papal chair had been vacant for four months. We know hardly anything of him beyond the part he took in the Athanasian controversy. He sided with Athanasius, and convoked a synod to be held under his presidency; but the Eastern churches were not inclined to admit the right of arbitration and decision of the Roman bishop in such matters (see *Epist. Synodalis Syn. Sardicensis ad Donatum*, in Mansi, 3, 136), and declared to Julius that they did not admit his superiority to any other bishop, even though his was the largest city; yet they would continue in friendly relation with him if he would renounce the plan of subverting their decisions. Julius persisted in holding the synod despite the absence of the Eastern bishops, and Athanasius was declared the lawful bishop. He also took part, through his legates, in the Synod of Sardica. The Eastern bishops of this council, after their withdrawal to Philippopolis, excommunicated Julius. But this continued opposition did not prevent him from writing in 349, on the return of Athanasius to Alexandria, to the Church of that city an autograph letter of congratulation. This letter, and the one mentioned above, are all that we have from the pen of Julius (see Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2, 23; Athanasius, *Apol.* 2, p. 770). He died April 12, 352, and is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church on that day. The Eastern Church erroneously considers Julius as the author of one of its liturgies. See Socrates, lib. 2 and 3; Baronius, *Ann. Ecclesiastes*; Tillemont, *Memoires*; Sozomen, *De Sect.* art. 8; Dupin, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastes*; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, April 12; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 27, 157.

Julius II, Pope, Cardinal Della Rovere,

nephew of pope Sixtus IV, took the papal chair after the one month's rule of Pius II, in 1503. He was born at Albezzola, near Savona, in 1441; became successively bishop of Carpentras, Albano, Ostia, Bologna, Avignon, and Mende and was finally made cardinal by his uncle, Sixtus IV. During the pontificate of Alexander VI, the most infamous and depraved of all the popes, Julian della Rovere already sought to prepare the way for his own succession in the pontificate; but the cardinal d'Amboise, archbishop of Rouen and minister of Louis XII, became his competitor, and the claims of the French prelate were sustained by an army marching against Rome. Outwitted in this attempt, Julian at once set out to procure his future success, and, persuading the Italian cardinals that their interest demanded the election of a native pope, secured the election of Piccolomini as pope Pius III. During the short reign of the latter Julian resumed his intrigues, and when Pius III died, twenty-six days after his election, Julian had so well succeeded in bribing the most influential cardinals by promises of power and temporal advantages that he received the position. After his exaltation to the papal throne, he set about to raise the papacy from the political degradation, to which it had sunk during the reign of his predecessors, generally termed "the night of the papacy." Determined to recover for the Church all that had belonged to the Roman see in the days of Innocent III, he began by driving Caesar Borgia out of his ill gotten possessions in the Romagna; but there he found another power, the Venetians, who, during the preceding troubles, had taken possession of Ravenna, Rimini, and other places. The Venetians offered to pay tribute to the see of Rome for those territories, but Julius refused, and demanded their absolute restitution to the Church. After fruitless negotiations, Julius, in 1508, made a league with Louis XII, the emperor Maximilian, and the duke of Ferrara, against Venice. This was called the League of Cambray, and its object was the destruction of the republic of Venice and the partition of its territories. Venice, however, stood firm, although its armies were defeated and its territories were ravaged by both Germans and French. At last Julius himself, having recovered the town of Romagna, perceived the impolicy of uniting with ultramontane sovereigns against the oldest Italian state, and accordingly, in Feb. 1510, he made peace with Venice. Wishing to undo the mischief which he had done, and to drive the foreigners (whom he styled "barbarians") out of Italy; he first sought to arm the Germans against the French, whom he dreaded most; but, not

succeeding, he called to his aid the Swiss. He himself took the field, and attacked and took the town of La Mirandola, entering it by a breach, in January, 1511; later he met with reverses, and lost Bologna. But in the following October his legates succeeded in forming a league, which he called "holy," with Ferdinand of Spain, Henry of England, the Venetians, and the Swiss. The campaign subsequent, in 1512, effected the total expulsion of the French from Lombardy. But this was done by the Swiss, German, and Spanish troops, and Julius merely succeeded in driving one party, of foreigners out of Italy by means of other foreigners, who meantime subverted the republic of Florence, and gave it to the Medici. In the midst of these events, Julius died of an inflammatory disease, on the 21st of February, 1513. He was succeeded by Leo X. Louis XII had convoked a council in order to obtain the approval of the French clergy on his warfare against Rome. To retort this measure the fifth Lateran Council was convoked (brought to a close after the accession of Leo X), and thus the designs of the French king were completely frustrated. As an ecclesiastical ruler Julius has little to recommend him in the eyes of the Christian Church. As a political sovereign, he is described by Ranke as "a noble soul, full of lofty plans for the glory and weal of Italy;" and professor Leo considers him, with all his defects, as one of the noblest characters of that age in Italy. He was fond of the fine arts, patronized Bramante, Michael Angelo, and Raffaele, and began the structure of St. Peter's Church. See *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7, 157; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 534 sq.; Baxmann, *Politik d. Papste*; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 7, 37 2 sq. (J.H.W.).

Julius III, Pope

(*Gian-Maria del Monte*, CARDINAL GIOCCI), succeeded Paul III in 1550. He was born at Monte San Sovino, near Arezzo, Sept. 10, 1487. He first studied law, but, securing the protection of his uncle, cardinal Antonio del Monte, he entered the Church, and soon became archbishop, and was intrusted with the administration of different dioceses. Paul III made him cardinal of St. Vitale and bishop of St. Palestrina, and sent him as one of the four legates to open the Council of Trent (q.v.). After his elevation to the pontificate he reopened (1551) the sittings of the Council of Trent, suspended under his predecessor (1549). Closely allied to Charles V, he spent his reign in quarrelling with France, Venice, and also with Ferdinand, king of the Romans, and brother of Charles V. His name is linked with English history by his efforts to organize with Mary the reunion of England

with Rome. *SEE POPE*. Julius III died in March 1555, leaving behind him a very indifferent character, marked by incapacity and misconduct. While a cardinal he was remarkable for his firmness and activity, but after becoming pope he gave himself up to luxury and pleasure, and went so far in his disregard of all consistency as to give the cardinal's place left vacant by his election to one of his servants, whose only merit consisted in having taken care of his pet monkey. See Ciacconi, *Vitoe Pontif.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 27, 165; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7, 158; Ranke, *Papacy*, 1, 201 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 7, 458 sq.

Jumenta, Cattle.

Heretics who denied the resurrection of the dead were accustomed to bestow opprobrious epithets on those who persisted in maintaining the truth of Scripture. Sometimes they called them *carnei*, *animales*, *jumenta*, carnal, sensual, cattle; also *lutei*, earthy, etc. — Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Jumpers Or Barkers

is a name for those persons who, as an inference from ~~1~~² Samuel 6:16, believe that religious worship must be accompanied by violent, agitations, convulsive leaping and dancing. This singular religious belief is said to have originated among the congregations of Mr. Whitefield, in the western part of Wales, about 1760, but it soon found friends among the Quakers, and later among the Irvingites. The Jumpers found special defenders in the Welsh poet William Williams (q.v.), Harris Rowland (q.v.), etc. They are sometimes called *Barkers* because frequently they do not confine their religious exuberances to jumping and dancing, but accompany them with violent groans and incoherent remarks, often degenerating into a sort of bellowing. Discountenanced in England, the Jumpers emigrated to the United States, and here they continue to flourish moderately. We believe they have some adherents in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and particularly in the extreme West. Evans, in his *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World* (Lond. 1811), relates his experience in a meeting of the Jumpers which he attended: "About the year 1785 I myself was very accidentally present at a meeting which terminated in jumping. It was held in the open air, on a Sunday evening, near Newport, in Monmouthshire. The preacher was one of lady Huntingdon's students, who concluded his sermon with the recommendation of jumping; and I must allow him the praise of consistency, for he got down from the chair on which he stood and jumped

along with his hearers. The arguments he adduced for this purpose were, that David danced before the ark, that the babe leaped in the womb of Elizabeth, and that the man whose lameness was removed leaped and praised God for the mercy which he had received! He expatiated on these topics with uncommon fervency, and then drew the inference that they ought to show similar expressions of joy for the blessings which Jesus Christ had put into their possession. He then gave an impassioned sketch of the sufferings of the Savior, and thereby roused the passions of a few around him into a state of violent agitation. About nine men and seven women for some little time rocked to and fro, groaned aloud, and then jumped with a kind of frantic fury. Some of the audience flew in all directions; others gazed on in silent amazement. They all gradually dispersed except the jumpers, who continued their exertions from eight in the evening till near eleven at night. I saw the conclusion of it; they at last kneeled down in a circle, holding each other by the hand, while one of them prayed with great fervor, and then, all rising up from off their knees, departed; but previous to their dispersion they wildly pointed up towards the sky, and are minded one another that they should soon meet there, and never again be separated."

Jung

SEE STILLING.

Ju'nia, Or Rather Ju'nias

(Ἰουνία, a deriv. of *Junius*, the name of a Roman family), a Christian at Rome, to whom Paul addressed a salutation in connection with Andronicus, as being his "kinsmen and fellow prisoners, who, are of note among the apostles," and were in Christ before himself (^{<5107>}Romans 16:7); hence probably of Jewish extraction. A.D. 55. As the gender of the epithets applied is uncertain (συγγενεῖς καὶ συναιχμαλώτους), some (e.g. Origen, Chrysostom, and other fathers) have supposed a female (Ἰουνίαν) comes equally well from Ἰουνία) to be meant (but see Michaelis, in Pott's *Sylloge*, 7, 128).

Junilius Of Africa,

generally believed to have been bishop in the 6th century, is known by his work *De partibus divine legis*, dedicated to a certain bishop Primasius, probably the one of Hadrumetum who in 553 indorsed the Constitutum of

Vigilius. Junilius himself claimed no originality, but acknowledged his obligation to a certain Paulus of Persia, supposed to have been Paulus of Bassora, who afterwards became metropolitan of Nisibis (though he was not a Persian). The work is in the form of a dialogue between a master and his pupil, and is a sort of introduction to the sacred writings. The first book, on Scripture, is divided into two parts, on the *outward expression* and the *inward meaning*; the outward expression contains five particulars — the species of writing, its authority, its author, its style, and its order of place. The inward meaning has reference especially to three particulars, God, this world, and the next. The second book treats of this world, its creation, its government, the properties and accidents of nature, the nature of will, and the consequences and results of will. Junilius then speaks of types, of predictions before and under the law concerning Christ and the calling of the Gentiles, and of Reason in its agreement with the commands of Scripture. Special attention is due to the fact that Junilius does not count the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, Judith, Esther, and the Maccabees among canonical books. The work has been published as Junilii de *Partibus Divinoe Legis*, libri 2 (Basil. 1545, 8vo; Francfort ad Oder, 1603, 8vo; and in *Biblioth. Patri.* 1). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7, 174 sq.; Clark, *Success. of Sac. Lit.* 2, 323.

Ju'niper

($\mu\tau\delta\rho\theta\eta\mu$, prob. so called from its use in *binding*; Sept. in ^{<1190>}1 Kings 19:4, Ῥάθαμ v.r. Ῥαθμέν; in verse 5, φυτόν; in ^{<830>}Job 30:4, ξύλον; in ^{<900>}Psalms 120:4, ἐρημικός; Vulg. *juniperus*. but in ^{<900>}Psalms 120:4, *desolatorius*), a shrub or tree mentioned as affording shade to Elijah in his flight to Horeb (^{<1190>}1 Kings 19:4, 5), and as affording material for fuel, and also, in extreme cases, for human food (^{<900>}Psalms 120:4; ^{<830>}Job 30:4). The older translators seem to have been unacquainted with it, while the modern versions have generally followed the Vulgate in referring it to the juniper (see Stengel in the *Biblioth. Brem.* 7, fasc. 5; Hiller, *Hierophyt.* 1, 253; Sprengel, *Gesch. d. Botan.* 1, 25), which, however, seems to be indicated by a different Hebrew word. *SEE HEATH.*

Picture for Juniper 1

The different species of juniper have by some botanists been ranked under *Cedrus*, the true species being distinguished by the title of *Cedrus baccifera*, and the pines by that of *Cedrus conifera*. Of *Juniperus*, the

ἄρκυθος of the Greeks and *abhul* of the Arabs, there are several species in Syria. Of these, *J. communis*, the common juniper, is a very widely diffused species, being found in Europe and Asia, in the plains of northern and in the mountains of southern latitudes, usually forming a low shrub, but in some situations being fifteen feet, and even thirty feet high, *J. oxycedrus*, the sharp or prickly, or brown berried juniper, closely allied to the common juniper, is an evergreen shrub, from ten to twelve, but sometimes even twenty feet high. It was found by M. Boyd on Mount Lebanon. *J.*

drupacea, or large fruited juniper, is a species which was introduced into Europe from the East under the Arabic name *habhel*. This name, however, is applied rather to all the species than to any one in particular. It is a native of Mount Cassius, and is thought to be the same as the greater juniper found by Belon on Mount Taurus, which he describes as rising to the height of a cypress. *J. Phoenicea*, or Phoenician juniper, is the great juniper of Dioscorides, and is a native of the south of Europe, Russia, and Syria. It has imbricated leaves, bears some resemblance to the cypress, and attains a height of from twenty to thirty feet. *J. Lycia*, or Lycian juniper, is a dwarf species, and *J. Sabina*, or the common Savine, is usually a low spreading shrub, but sometimes rises to the height often or twelve feet. It is a native of the south of Europe and Syria. Of these species, *J. oxycedrus* and *J. Phoenicea* are the only species which could have been the *berosh* of Scripture. Some are of opinion that the wood of *J. oxycedrus*, rather than that of the so called cedar of Lebanon is the cedar wood so famed in ancient times for its durability, and which was therefore employed in making statues. It is to the wood of certain species of juniper that the name of cedar wood is now specially applied. **SEE CEDAR.**

Picture for Junniper 2

The *rothem*, however, is no doubt the plant still called by the Arabs *retem*, and commonly known as *Spanish broom*. In Loudon's *Encyclopoedia of Plants* it is named *Spartium monospermum*, or white single-seeded broom, and is described as a very handsome shrub, remarkable for its numerous snow white flowers. Osbeck remarks that it grows like willow bushes along the shores of Spain, as far as the flying sands reach, where scarcely any other plant exists except the *Ononis serpens*, or creeping *restharrow*. The use of this, shrub is very great in stopping the sand. The leaves and young branches furnish delicious food for goats. It converts the most, barren spot into a fine odoriferous garden by its flowers, which continue a long time. It seems to shelter hogs and goats against the scorching heat of the sun. The

twigs are used for tying bundles, and all kinds of herbs that are brought to market are fastened together with them. The Spaniards call it *retama*, from the Arabic name *retem*. It is now referred by all botanists to the genus *Genista*, and called *G. monosperma*. It is described by De Candolle as a branching and erect shrub, with slender, wand like, flexible branches; leaves comparatively few, linear, oblong, pressed to the branches, pubescent; inflorescence in few flowered lateral racemes; petals white, silky, nearly equal to one another; legumes oval, inflated, smooth, membranaceous, one to two seeded. It occurs on the sterile shores of Portugal, Spain, Barbary, and Egypt. It was found by Forskal at Suez, and named by him *Genista Spartium?* with *roetoem* as its Arabic name. Bove also found it at Suez, and again in different parts of Syria. Belon also mentions finding it in several places when traveling in the East. Burckhardt also frequently mentions the shrub *rethem* in the deserts to the south of Palestine, and he thought it to be the same plant as the *Genista roetoem* of Forskal. He states that whole plains are sometimes covered with this shrub, and that such places are favorite places of pasturage, as sheep are remarkably fond of the pods. Lord Lindsay again, while traveling in the middle of the valleys of Mount Sinai, says, "The *rattam*, a species of broom, bearing a white flower, delicately streaked with purple, afforded me frequent shelter from the sun while in advance of the caravan" (*Letters*, p. 183). Dr. Robinson, in his journey from Akabah to Jerusalem, says (*Researches*, 2, 124): "The shrubs which we had met with throughout the desert still continued. One of the principal of these is the *retem*, a species of the broom plant, the *Genista roetoem* of Forskal. This is the largest and most conspicuous shrub of these deserts, growing thickly in the water courses and valleys. Our Arabs always selected the place of encampment, if possible, in a spot where it grew, in order to be sheltered by it at night from the wind; and during the day, when they often went on in advance of the camels, we found them not unfrequently sitting or sleeping under a bush of *retem* to protect them from the sun. It was in this very desert, a day's journey from Beersheba, that the prophet Elijah lay down and slept beneath the same shrub" (~~1~~1 Kings 19:4, 5, "under a juniper tree"). It affords shade and protection, both in heat and storm, to travelers (Virgil, *Georg.* 2, 434, 436), and Bonar describes it as particularly useful for shelter in the peninsula of Arabia Petraea (*Sinai*, p. 190).

In the other passages the meaning is not so clear, and therefore different interpretations have been given. Thus Job (~~38~~Job 30:4) says of the half

famished people who despised him, "Who cut up mallows by the bushes, and *rothem* roots for their food." Though the broom root may perhaps be more suitable for diet than the *juniper*, yet they are both too bitter and medicinal to be considered or used as nutritious, and therefore some say that "when we read that *rothem* roots were their food, we are to suppose a great deal more than the words express, namely, that their hunger was so violent as not to refrain even from these roots," which were neither refreshing nor nourishing. Dr. Thomson's ingenious suggestion (*Land and Book*, 2, 438), that perhaps the mallows only were used for food, and the *rothem* roots as fuel to cook them with, seems hardly tenable from the phraseology. Ursinus supposes (*Arboret. Bibl.* c. 27) that instead of the roots of this broom we are to understand a plant which grows upon these roots, as well as upon some other plants, and which is well known by the English name of *broom rape*, the *orobanche* of botanists. These are sometimes eaten. Thus Dioscorides (2, 136) observes that the *orobanche*, which grows from the roots of broom, was sometimes eaten raw, or boiled like asparagus. Celsius again suggests an amendment in the sentence, and thinks that we should understand it to mean that the broom roots were required for *fuel*, and not for *food*, as the Hebrew words signifying fuel and *food*, though very similar to each other, are very different in their derivation (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1317; on the contrary, Michaelis, *Neue Orient. Bibl.* 5, 4, 5), and this sense is confirmed by some of the Talmudical writers, as R. Levi ben-Gerson, in his remarks on this passage, says. The broom is the only fuel procurable in many of these desert situations (see Thevenot, *Trav.* 1, 222). In ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 120:4, David observes that the calumnies of his enemies were "like arrows of the mighty, with coals of *rothem*." The broom, being no doubt very commonly used as fuel in a country where it is abundant and other plants scarce, might readily suggest itself in a comparison; but it is also described as sparkling, burning, and crackling more vehemently than other wood, and the Arabs regard it as yielding the best charcoal. Thus the tree which afforded shade to Elijah may have furnished also the "coals" or ashes for baking the cake which satisfied his hunger (~~1 Kings~~ 1 Kings 19:6). See Celsius, *Hierobot.* 1, 246; Oedmann, *Verm. Sammlungen*, 2, 8; Forskal, *Flora Aeg. et Arab.* p. 56 and 214; Schultens, *Comment. on Job*, ad loc.; Robinson, *Research.* 1, 299; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 483; Pliny. *H.N.* 24, 9, 65; Balfour, *Plants of the Bible*, p. 50; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 20, 79, 521.

Junius, Francis

son of the following, was born at Heidelberg, 1589. In early life he studied mathematics, but finally turned his attention to literature and theology. After finishing his studies he went to France to visit his parents. In 1620 he came over to England, and was received into the house of the earl of Arundel, where he lived as his librarian for thirty years. In 1650 he returned to the Continent, in order to pass some time in the bosom of his family. For two years he lived in Friesland, in a district where the ancient Saxon tongue was preserved, that he might study the language. In 1675 he returned to England, and in 1676 went to Oxford, whence he retired to Windsor, to his nephew saad Vossius; and died there Nov. 19 1677. He was a very learned philologist, as is evinced by his writings, — which are *De pictura Veterum*, libri 3 (Amsterdam, 1637, 4to): — *Observationes in Willeramii Paraphrasim Francicam Cantici Canticorum* (Amsterdam, 1655, 8vo): — *Annotationes in harmoniam Latino-francicam quatuor Evangelistarum Latine a Tatian. confectam* (Amsterd. 1655, 8vo): — *Quatuor D.N.J.C. Evangeliorum Versiones perantiquoe duoe, Gothica scilicet et Anglo-saxonica*, etc.; *Accedit et glossarium Gothicum: cui proemittitur alphabetum Gothicum, Runicum, Anglo-saxonicum*, etc. (Dordrecht, 1655, 4to): — *Coedemonis Paraphrasis poetica Geneseos* (Amsterdam, 1655, 4to). His *Etymologicum Anglicanum* was edited by Edward Lye, Oxford, 1743, folio. — Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* 1, 697.

Junius, Franciscus

(*Françoise Du Jon*), an eminent French Protestant theologian, was born at Bourges in 1545. He studied law at first, but embracing the principles of the Reformation, for which his father suffered persecution, he removed to Geneva in 1562, to study the dead languages and theology. In 1565 he took charge of a Walloon congregation at Antwerp: the party troubles of the time, however, obliged him to withdraw first to a church in Limburg, and finally to Germany. Frederick II welcomed him at Heidelberg, and he obtained a church in the Palatinate. During the war of 1568 he lived in the Low Countries, and was chaplain of the Prince of Orange. He afterwards again returned to his charge, and remained there until 1573, when he was called to Heidelberg by the elector, to take part with Tremellius in the translation of the Old Testament. After being also for a while professor of theology at Heidelberg, he returned to France in 1592 with the duke of Bouillon, and was employed by Henry IV on a mission to Germany. Later

he accepted a professorship at Leyden, where he remained until his death in 1602. His principal work was the Latin translation of the Old Testament, which he executed in conjunction with Tremellius. It appeared in five parts, the first containing the five books of Moses (Frankfort, 1576, folio); the second embracing the historical books, 1576; the third the poetical books; 1579; the fourth the prophets, 1579; and the fifth the apocryphal books, 1579. After the death of Tremellius the translation was revised by his colleague, and printed at London, 1584, 8vo. In the course of twenty years it passed through twenty editions, and was printed for the last time at Zurich, 1764, 8vo. Junius lived to superintend a third edition, 1596, folio; but the best edition probably is *the seventh*, published in 1624, folio, containing a good index by Paul Tossanus. "The index was published in volume by itself at Frankfort; 1687, folio, and repeatedly after. The translation cannot be called elegant; it is too literal, and is sometimes obscure on that account. It is also disfigured with useless glosses and rabbinical traditions" (Kitto). He wrote besides, *Apocalypseos Analysis* (1592): — *Grammatica Linguae Hebraeae* (3d edition, 1593): — *Acta Apostolorum et epistolae 2 S. Pauilli ad Corinth. ex Arabica translatione Latine reddita* — *Procatacema ad V.T. interpretationem*: — *proelectiones in 3 priora capita Geneseos*: — *Explicatio 4 priorum Psalmorum*: — *Psalmus 101, seu principis Christiani institutio*: — *Comment. in Ezechielem: Expositio Danielis*: — *Lectiones in Jonam*: — *Sacra parallela*: — *Notae, in Epistolam S. Judae*. His *Opera theologica* were published at Geneva in 1613, in two vols. folio. and are partly exegetical, partly philological and polemic. His autobiography, which is published at the beginning of his works, was written in 1595, and is the source of his biographies published by Melch. Adam and in Bayle's *Dictionary*. See Haag. *La France Protestante*; Herzog, *Real-Encykop.* s.v.; Kitto, s.v. (J.H.W.)

Junius, Robert

a Dutch missionary, a native of Delft, who flourished in the 17th century, was sent by the Dutch government to the western part of the island of Formosa in 1634, and was eminently successful in his missionary labors. He is said to have baptized no less than six thousand persons. He also provided good educational advantages for the natives, and over six hundred young men crowded the schools he had founded. Of his personal history in other respects we are ignorant. His literary labors were confined to efforts in behalf of the people to whom he was sent. He composed some

prayers, and translated certain Psalms into the Formosan language. He returned to Holland in after days, but the date of his death is not known to us. See Mosheim, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 3, bk. 4, cent. 17, sect. 1, note 24.

Junkin, George, D.D., LL.D.

a Presbyterian minister of note, was born in Kingston, Cumberland Comity, Pa., Nov. 1, 1790, entered Jefferson College in 1809, and graduated in 1813. While at college he was converted (1811), and upon the completion of his collegiate studies he entered at once on a theological course of study under Dr. John M. Mason in New York city, was ordained at Gettysburg, Pa. in 1818, and remained in the pastorate, though teaching and editing a paper a part of the time, till 1830. He was principal of Pennsylvania Manual Labor Academy at Germantown, Pa., from 1830 to 1832; president of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., from 1832 to 1841; president of Miami University from 1841 to 1844; Was then recalled to the presidency of Lafayette College; and was president of Washington College, Lexington, Va., from 1848 to 1861, when, on the secession of Virginia, he left the college, his home, and his property. Lafayette College thereafter honored him with an Emeritus professorship. He died May 20, 1868. "Dr. Junkin for many years maintained a great influence in the Church courts, sustained by his thorough knowledge of every subject on which he attempted to speak, and the keen logic with which he exposed the fallacies in the arguments of his opponents. In 1844 he was moderator of the General Assembly. In 1833 he received the degree of D.D. from Jefferson College, and in 1856 that of LL.D. from Rutgers College. Dr. Junkin performed an amazing amount of work in his lifetime. His preaching record shows that he delivered a larger number of sermons than most pastors do, while his toils in building up and reviving colleges, in laborious agencies, in ecclesiastical labors in the Church courts, in the professor's chair, at the editor's desk, and through the press, in his numerous books, sermons, and essays, make us wonder how he could find the time and endure the labor of doing so much." He published *The Educator*, a periodical, in 1838; *The Vindication*, containing a history of the trial of the Rev. Albert Barnes by the Second Presbytery and by the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1836; *A Treatise on Justification*, in 1839; *The Little Stone and the Great Image, or Lectures on the Prophecies*, in 1844; *The Great Apostasy*, a sermon on Romanism, in 1853; *Political Fallacies*, in 1862; *A Treatise on Sanctification*, in 1864; and *The Tabernacle, or the Gospel according to Moses*. in 1865. See Index volume (No. 2) to *Princeton Review*, p. 226 sq.

Juno

the Roman name of the queen of heaven, essentially identical with the Grecian *Hera*. Juno was the daughter of Kronos (Saturn) and Rhea. She was the highest and most powerful divinity of the Greeks and Romans next to Jupiter (the Greek *Ζεύς*), of whom she was the sister and wife. Argos and Samos claimed the honor of her birth. According to Homer, she was educated by Oceanus and Thetis; according to others, by the Hours. Her marriage with Jupiter on the island of Crete was honored by the presence of all the gods. This marriage, according to Homer, was consummated without the knowledge of their parents. Others say that he subdued her by artifice on the island of Samos, and there married her. According to the Greek conception of her character, she was proud, ambitious, and jealous; and in the Homeric poems she is represented as an obstinate, quarrelsome shrew and her temper a source of continual discord between herself and her lord. She often spitefully favors persons who were the objects of his displeasure, and he, in return, treats her with all that severity which, in ancient times, the husband was accustomed to use towards the wife. He scolds and often beats her, and on one occasion, when she had driven Hercules, the favorite of her husband, to Cos by a storm, Jupiter was so angry that he bound her hands and feet, loaded her with two anvils; and suspended her from Olympus; and, to add to the inconveniences of her situation, none of the gods were permitted to help her. During the Trojan War she lulls Jupiter to sleep, in order to give the victory to the Greeks during his slumbers, and with difficulty escapes the blows which are aimed at her when he awakes. No one of the goddesses dared contend with her. Diana once attempted it, but her cheeks exhibited the most woeful evidences of the strength of the mighty Juno. All, in fine, who assumed to themselves or attributed to others a superiority to her, experienced her vengeance. But she is, notwithstanding, a female of majestic beauty, the grandest of the Olympian goddesses, well calculated to inspire awe, although wanting the soft, insinuating, and heart touching beauty of Venus. As the only wedded goddess in the Greek mythology, she naturally presided over marriage and the birth of children. It is a significant feature of the Roman character that Juno, in addition to her other qualities, was the guardian of the national finances, watching over her people like a thrifty mother and housewife; and a temple, containing the mint, was erected to her on the Capitoline as Juno *Moneta* (the Money coiner). In the Roman conception she was also the goddess of chastity, and prostitutes

were forbidden to touch her altars. She was, in short, the protector of women. She not only presided over the fertility of marriage, but also over its inviolable sanctity, and unchastity and inordinate love of sexual pleasures were hated by the goddess. Women in childbed invoked Juno Lucina to help them, and after the delivery of the child a table was laid out for her in the house for a whole week, for newly born children were likewise under her protection. The month of June, which was originally called Junonius, was considered to be the most favorable period for marrying. As Juno has the same characteristics as her husband in so far as they refer to the female sex, she presides over all human affairs, which are based upon justice and faithfulness, but especially over domestic affairs, in which women are more particularly concerned. The companions of Juno were the Nymphs, Graces, and Hours. Isis was her particular servant. Among animals, the peacock, the goose, and the cuckoo were sacred to her. Her usual attribute is the royal diadem, formed like a long triangle. She is drawn in a carriage by two peacocks. She had several temples in Rome. The first day of every month, and the whole of June, were sacred to her. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, 2, 658.

Ju'piter

(the Latin form of the Greek *name Zeus*, Ζεύς Genit. Διός), the principal deity of the Greek and Roman mythology, in which he is fabled to have been the son of Saturn and Ops. He is supposed to represent the fertilizing power of the heavens (see Creuzer, *Symbolik*, 2, 518, 522), and was worshipped under various epithets. See Walch, *Dissert in Acta Apost.* 3, 173; compare Horace, *Odyssey*, 1, 10, 5; Ovid, *Fasti*, 5, 495; *Metamorph.* 8, 626; Tzetz. in Lycophr. 481; "Hermes κήρυξ Διός," Apollod. *Bibl.* 3, 10, 2; Homer, *Iliad.* 2, 402; Virg. *AEn.* 3, 21; 9, 627; Xen. *Cyrop.* 8, 3, 31; Senec. *Herc. Fur.* 299. **SEE MERCURY; SEE DIANA.** (See Schmebel, *De Jove πολιούχῳ ad Ac.* Altdorf, 1740). This deity is alluded to in several passages of the Bible, and Josephus frequently refers to his worship. The following statements are chiefly from Kitto's *Cyclopoedia*, s.v.:

1. It is stated in 2 Macc. 6:1, 2, that "the king sent an old man of Athens (Sept. Ἀθηναῖον; Vulg. *Antiochenum*) (some say 'an old man, Atheneas,' but Grotius, following the Latin, suggests instead of Ἀθηναῖον to read Ἀντιόχειον) to compel the Jews to depart from the laws of their fathers, and not to live after the laws of God; and to pollute also the Temple in

Jerusalem, and to call it the temple of Jupiter Olympius (Atob [Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου](#)), and that in Gerizim, of Jupiter the defender of strangers (Sept. [Διὸς Ξενίου](#); Vulg. *hospitalis*), as they did desire that dwelt in the place." Olympius was a very common epithet of Zeus, and he is sometimes simply called [Ὀλύμπιος](#) (Homer, 2. 19, 108). Olympia, in Greece, was the seat of the temple and sacred grove of Zeus Olympius, and it was here that the famous statue of gold and ivory, the work of Phidias, was erected. Caligula attempted to have this statue removed to Rome, and it was only preserved in its place by the assurance that it would not bear removal (Josephus, *Ant.* 19, 1, 1). Antiochus Epiphanes, as related by Athenaeus, surpassed all other kings in his worship and veneration of the gods, so that it was impossible to count the number of the statues he erected. His especial favorite was Zeus. The Olympian Zeus was the national god of the Hellenic race (Thucydides, 3, 14), as well as the supreme ruler of the heathen world, and, as such, formed the true opposite to Jehovah, who had revealed himself as the God of Abraham. Antiochus commenced, in B.C. 174, the completion of the temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens (Polybius, *Reliq.* 26, 10; Livy, *Hist.* 41, 20), and associated the worship of Jupiter with that of Apollo at Daphne, erecting a statue to the former god resembling that of Phidias at Olympia (Amm. Marcell. 22, 13, 1). Games were celebrated at Daphne by Antiochus, of which there is a long account in Polybius (*Reliq.* 31, 3) and Atheneus (5, 5). Coins also were struck referring to the god and the games (Mionnet, 5, 215; Muller, *Antiq. Antioch.* p. 62-64). On the coins of Elis, the wreath of wild olive ([κότινος](#)) distinguishes Zeus Olympius from the Dodonaean Zeus, who has an oak wreath.

Antiochus, after compelling the Jews to call the Temple of Jerusalem the temple of Jupiter Olympius, built an idol altar upon the altar of God. Upon this altar swine were offered every day, and the broth of their flesh was sprinkled about the Temple (1 Macc. 1:46; 2 Macc. 6:5; Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 5, 4; 13, 8, 2; *War.* 1, 1, 2). The idol altar which was upon the altar of God ([τὸν βωμὸν ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου](#)) was considered by the Jews to be the "abomination of desolation" ([βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημόσεως](#), 1 Macc. 1:54) foretold by Daniel (11:31; 12:11) and mentioned by our Lord (⁴²⁴⁵Matthew 24:15). Many interpretations of the meaning of this prophecy have been given. **SEE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.**

The grove of Daphne was not far from Antioch ([Δάφνη ἢ πρὸς Ἀντιόχειαν](#), 2 Macc. 4:33; Josephus, *War.* 1, 12, 15), and at this city

Antiochus Epiphanes erected a temple for the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. *SEE DAPHNE*. It is described by Livy as having its walls entirely adorned with gold (41, 20). To Jupiter Capitolinus the Jews, after the taking of Jerusalem, in whatever country they might be, were compelled by Vespasian to pay two drachmae, as they used to pay to the Temple at Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, 7, 6, 6; Dion Cass. 66, 7). Hadrian, after the second revolt of the Jews, erected a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus in the place where the temple of God formerly stood (Dion Cass. 69, 12). There is, probably, reference made to Jupiter Capitolinus in ^{<27118>}Daniel 11:38, alluding to Antiochus Epiphanes: "But in his estate shall he worship the god of forces" (fortresses, *יְצֵמַי יְהֵאֵ*, see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v. *יְצֵמַי*; p. 1011), for under this name Jupiter was worshipped by the victorious general on his return from a campaign, and it was in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus that he celebrated his triumph. Other conjectures have been made relative to this passage, but the opinion of Gesenius seems most probable. *SEE MAUZZIM*.

In the passage from 2 Macc. above quoted a temple was also ordered to be set up to Zeus Xenius on Mount Gerizim. Josephus gives a different account. He relates that the Samaritans, who, when it pleased them, denied that they were of the kindred of the Jews, wrote to Antiochus, the god (*θεός* on coins) Epiphanes, begging him to allow the temple on, Mount Gerizim, which had no name (*ἄνώνυμον ἱερόν*; comp. "Ye worship ye know not what," ^{<4012>}John 4:22), to be called the temple of Jupiter Hellenius (*Ant.* 12, 5, 5). This petition is said to have been granted. The epithet *Ξένιος* is given to Zeus as the supporter of hospitality and the friend of strangers (Plutarch, *Amator.* 20; Xenoph. *Anab.* 3 2, 4; Virgil, *Aeneid.* 1, 735, etc.), and it is explained in 2 Macc. by the clause "as they did desire (Greek *καθώς ἐτύγγανον*, as they were; Vulg. *prout erant hi*, [as they were]) who dwelt in the place." Ewald supposes that Jupiter was so called on account of the hospitable disposition of the Samaritans (*Geschichte*, 4, 339, note), while Jahn suggests that it was because the Samaritans, in their letter to Antiochus Epiphanes, said that they were strangers in that country (*Hebrew Commonwealth*, 1, 319); Grotius says because the dwellers of the place were pilgrims from the regions of Mysia and Mesopotamia, specially referring to their idolatrous practices (^{<12724>}2 Kings 17:24 sq.).

2. The appearance of the gods upon earth was very commonly believed among the ancients. Accordingly we find that Jupiter and Mercury are said

to have wandered in Phrygia, and to have been entertained by Baucis and Philemon (Ovid, *Met.* 8, 611 sq.). Hence the people of Lycaonia, as recorded in Acts (~~4441~~ Acts 14:11), cried out, "The gods have come down to us in the likeness of men; and they called Barnabas Jupiter, and Paul Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker." Barnabas was probably identified with Jupiter not only because Jupiter and Mercury were companions (Ovid. *Fast.* 5, 495), but because his personal appearance was majestic (Chrysostom, *Hom.* 30; Alford, on ~~4442~~ Acts 14:12; comp. ~~4700~~ 2 Corinthians 10:1, 10). Paul was identified with Mercury as the speaker, for this god was the god of eloquence (Horace, lib. 1, od. 10:5, etc.). The temple of Jupiter at Lystra appears to have been outside the gates (τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, ~~4443~~ Acts 14:13), as was frequently the custom (Strabo, 14, 4; Herod. 1, 26), and the priest being summoned, oxen and garlands were brought, in order to do sacrifice with the people to Paul and Barnabas, who, filled with horror, restrained the people with great difficulty. It is well known that oxen were wont to be sacrificed to Jupiter (Homer, *Il.* 2, 402; Virgil, *AEn.* 3, 21; 9, 627; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 7, 3, 11, etc.). According to the interpretation of others, however, the sacrifice was about to be offered before the doors of the house where the apostles were (ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας). Alford (*Comment.* ad loc.) denies that there is any ellipsis of τοῦ ναοῦ in the phrase ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς his references, however, do not sustain his position; for Ζεὺς προπύλωνος would not necessarily be πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, but merely the tutelary deity of a private mansion.

Picture for Jupiter

3. The word Ε δία (fair or fine weather) is derived from εὔ and Δία. Jupiter, as lord of heaven, had power over all the changes of the weather. The Latins even used his name to signify the air — sub Dio (Horace, lib. 2, od. 3, 23), sub Jove frigidus (Horace, lib. 1, od. 1, 25, etc. comp. "the image which fell down from Jupiter," A. Vers.; καὶ τοῦ διοπετοῦς, ~~4485~~ Acts 19:35). The word εὐδία occurs in ~~4162~~ Matthew 16:2, and in Ecclus. 3, 15. (For a full account of Jupiter and Zeus, see Smith's *Dict. of Biography*, s.v.; and for a list of the epithets applied to this god, see Rawlinson, *Herod.* vol. 1, Appendix, p. 680.)

Jure Divino

an expression meaning "*by divine right*" used in connection with the question of the *source* of the ministerial authority. They who claim the "*jus divinum*" for that authority contend that the episcopal discipline and orders, having issued immediately from the authority of God, are the *exclusive* channel through which holy ordinances can be lawfully or efficaciously exercised. Others again (who consequently relinquish the *jure-divino* claim), while they maintain that the episcopal regimen is agreeable to the will of Christ and the practice of his apostles, do not find a warrant for holding the above exclusive views, nor for asserting the utter invalidity, while they still admit the irregularity of any other ministrations. In their opinion, the claims of a Christian ministry rest not on any unbroken succession, but on the basis of the *divinely sanctioned* institution of a Christian Church. The authority, therefore with which a Christian minister is invested they consider to be derived from Christ only by virtue of the sanction given by him to Christian communities; and they hold that it comes direct from the Church in whose name and behalf he acts as its representative, and just to that extent to which it has empowered and directed him to act. They consider that the system which makes the sacramental virtue of holy orders inherent indefeasibly in each individual minister detracts from the claims of the Church, makes the Church a sort of appendage to the priesthood, and, in fact, confounds the Church with the clergy, as if the spiritual community consisted only of its officers — Eden, *Eccles. Dictionary*, s.v. *SEE SUCCESSION*.

Jurieu, Pierre,

an eminent French Protestant theologian, was born at Mer, in the diocese of Blois, in 1637. He was the son of a Protestant minister, and nephew of the celebrated Rivet and Du Moulin. He possessed uncommon talents, and when barely nineteen received the master's degree, and after traveling in Holland and England, returned to his country to succeed his father in his pastoral office. His reputation for learning in 1674 obtained for him the situation of professor of theology and the Hebrew language in the Huguenot seminary at Sedan. When in 1681 the Protestants were deprived by Louis XIV of the permission, to give public instruction in that town, he retired to Rouen, and from thence went to Rotterdam, where he was appointed professor of *theology*. In that city the ardor of his zeal soon drew him into controversy with Bayle, Basnage, and Saurin, in the heat of

which he manifested the same rancor which unfortunately disgraces most of his polemical writings. He allowed himself likewise to fall into various errors by too much indulging a naturally lively imagination in the interpretation of prophecy. In his *Commentary on the Apocalypse* he even predicted the establishment of Protestantism in France during the year 1686. Those who differed from him in opinion, however high their character for learning and piety, he treated with a most unbecoming severity. Grotius and Hammond, perhaps the two greatest theologians of their age, because they differed from him on the subject of the Antichrist predicted in the book of Revelation, he styles "the disgrace of the Reformed Church, and even of Christianity." The same spirit is manifested in his well known controversy with the great Bossuet, whom he does not scruple to accuse of falsehood and dishonesty, though on the other hand; it must be allowed that the recriminations of this celebrated defender of the Church of Rome; if more politely expressed, are equally severe and destitute of truth; the great object of Bossuet being, it would appear, to charge his antagonist with holding the heretical opinions of the Socinians (Bossuet, *Hist. des Vindications*, 4, 64; 5, 236-238). With all these defects, Jurieu stands deservedly high as a controversialist. His learning was most profound; he is generally exact in the citation of his authorities, and he had a special talent in discovering the weak point in the cause of his antagonists. In respect of style and eloquence he is immeasurably behind Bossuet, but he is at least his equal in polemical talent, and by some is considered his superior in erudition. All of his writings are held in esteem by theologians of every shade as a storehouse of great research. Jurieu's private life was becoming that of a Christian minister; he was charitable to the poor almost beyond his means, and employed his influence abroad in alleviating the sufferings of his exiled brethren. He died Jan. 11, 1713. His principal works are, *Histoire. du Calvinisme et du Papisme mise en parallele*, etc. (Rotterdam, 1682, 2 vols. 12mo; 2d edit., *ibid.* 1683, 12mo): — *Lettres Pastorales* (Rotterdam, 1686-7, 3 vols. 12mo): — *Le Vrai Systeme de l'Eglise* (Dord. 1686, 8vo): *L'Esprit de M. Arnauld* (Deventer [Rotterdam], 1684, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Prejuges legitimes contre le Papisme* (Amst. 1685, 8vo): — *Apologie pour l'Accomplissement des Propheties* (1687, which has been translated into English, Lond. 1687, 2 parts, 8vo): — *La Religion des Latitudinaires* (Rotterd. 1696, 8vo); *Histoire des Dogmes et des Cultes* (Amst. 1704, 12mo; also translated into English, Lond. 1705, 2 vols.): — *La politique du clerge de France* (Amst.

1681, 12mo). — *English Cyclop.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 7, 126; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 27, 267 sq.

Jurisdiction

is an ecclesiastical term denoting the power and authority vested in a bishop, by virtue of the apostolical commission, of governing and administering the laws of the Church within the bounds of his diocese. The same term is also used to express the bounds within which a bishop exercises his power, i.e. his diocese. To define this power of the ecclesiastic properly from that of civil jurisdiction has led to no little discussion. Of old the earl and bishop sat in the same court. Afterwards the bishop held his courts by himself, though temporal lords sat in synod with bishops — "the one to search the laws of the land, and the other the laws of God." The question of jurisdiction, after the period of the Conqueror, was often agitated between the pope and sovereigns. The things, the latter argued, and reasonably, that are Caesar's belong to Caesar, and it is treason to take them from him; the things that are God's belong to God, and it is impiety to take them from him. The Church is a free society, and should have perfect power of self government within its own domain, and a purely spiritual sentence should be beyond review by a civil court. *SEE INVESTITURE; SEE KEYS, POWER OF.*

Jus Asyli

the right of protection. From the 4th century, the privilege of asylum, or the right of protecting criminals, was possessed by Christian churches and altars. This privilege had belonged to sacred places among Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, and from them it may have been adopted by Christians. It seems to have been first introduced into the Christian Church in the time of Constantine; but the right was subsequently much circumscribed by various restrictions, as it was found to be a serious hindrance to the administration of justice. Since the 16th century the privilege has been almost entirely abolished. — Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v. *SEE ASYLUM.*

Jus Devolutum

(devolved right). When, in the Established Church of Scotland, a patron does not present to a parish within six months after the commencement of the vacancy, the right of presentation falls to the presbytery, *tanquam jure*

devoluto. Still further to guard against abuse, it has been enacted (act 1719, c. 29) "that if patron shall present any person to a vacant church who shall not be qualified, by taking and subscribing the said oath in manner aforesaid, or shall present a person to any vacancy who is then or shall be pastor or minister of any other church or parish, or any person who shall not accept or declare his willingness to accept of the presentation and charge to which he is presented, within the said time, such presentation shall not be accounted any interruption of the course of time allowed to the patron for presenting; but the *jus devolutum* shall take place as if no such presentation had been offered, any law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding." — Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, s.v. *SEE PATRONAGE*.

Jus Exuviarum.

SEE SPOLIATION.

Jus Gislii Or Metatus.

SEE IMMUNITY.

Ju'shab-he'sed

(Hebrew *Yushab'-Che'sed*, בְּשִׁבְיָ דְשִׁי , *returner of kindness*; Sept. Ἀσοβαῆσδ v.r. Ἀσοβῆθ; *Vulg. Josabhesed*), the last named of the sons of Pedaiah, of the royal line of Judah (^{<32>}1 Chronicles 2:20; see Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 17, where it is shown that this is not a son of Zerubbabel, as appears in the text, which, immediately adds that these sons were in all *five*, either meaning merely those enumerated in the same verse, or requiring one of these [prob. the one in question, since it lacks the distinctive connecting particle *w*, "and"] to be regarded as another name for the preceding, inasmuch as at least *six* sons would otherwise be enumerated. See ver. 19). B.C. cir. 536.

Jus primarum precum.

SEE EXPECTANCY.

Justel, Christopher

an eminent French Protestant canonist, was born at Paris in 1580. He became counsellor and secretary to the king of France, and died in 1649.

He is said to have been one of the most learned men of the Middle Ages, and, *according* to Haag, one of those whose writings throw great light on the obscure parts of the history of the early Church. His works have been published under the style of *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris, in duos tomos distributa, quorum unus canonum ecclesiasticorum codices antiquos, tum Groeos, tum Latinos complectitur; alter vero insigniores juris canonici veteris collectores Groecos exhibet, ex antiquis codicibus MSS. Bibliothecae Christophori Justelli. Opera et studio Gulielmi Voelli, theologi ac socii Sarbonici, et Henrici Justelli, Christophori F.* (Paris, 1661, 2 vols. fol.). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 27, 287.

Justel, Henry

a French Protestant canonist, son of Christopher Justel (q.v.), was born at Paris in 1620. He succeeded his father as secretary and counsellor to king Henry IV. He appears to have foreseen the coming revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), and went to London in 1681. He was there appointed librarian of St. James, and retained that situation until his death Sept. 24, 1693. He had sent to the University of Oxford, by his friend Dr. Hickee, the original Greek MS. of the *Canones Ecclesioe universalis*, and received in return from that institution the degree of LL.D. in 1675. He was a friend of Locke and Leibnitz, and corresponded with most of the learned men of his day, by all of whom he was highly esteemed. His principal work is his edition of Christopher Justel's (see above) *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris*. See *Chauffepie, Nouv. Dict. Histor. et Crit.*; Dupin, *Bibliotheca des Auteurs Eccles.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 27, 289.

Justi, Karl Wilhelm

a German Protestant theologian, was born at Marburg, January 14, 1767. He was educated at Jena, and became a private tutor at Metzlar, whence he removed to Marburg as a preacher in 1790. In 1793 he was chosen professor of philosophy in the university. In 1801 he was appointed archdeacon; soon after, superintendent and consistorialrath; in 1814 was made oberpfarrer, and in 1822 professor of theology. He died Aug. 7, 1846. Justi devoted himself to the study of O. and N.T. exegesis, after the method of Eichhorn and Herder. He was a man of erudition, taste, and liberality. The Prophets of the O.T. occupied his chief attention, and he published editions of several books of the O. Test. Scriptures. But he is especially noted for the three following works: *Nationalgesange der*

Hebraer (1803-1818, 3 vols.): — an enlarged edition of Herder's *Geist der Hebraischen Poesie* (1829, 2 vols.): — *Blumien althebraischer Dichtkunst* (1809, 2 vols.): — *Zionitische Harfenklänge* (1829). — Kitto, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, 2, 699; Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lex.* 8, 566.

Justice

(**qdx**, *righteousness*, as an internal trait of character; **FPV**, *judgment*, as a judicial act), as applied to men, is one of the four cardinal virtues. It consists, according to Cicero (*De Finibus*, lib. 5, cap. 23), *in suo cuique tribuendo*, in according to every one his right. By the Pythagoreans, and also by Plato, it was regarded as including all human virtue or duty. The word *righteousness* is used in our translation of the Scriptures in a like extensive signification. As opposed to equity justice (**τὸ νομικόν**) means doing merely what positive law requires, while equity (**τὸ ἴσον**) means doing what is, fair and right in the circumstances of every particular case. Justice is not founded in law, as Hobbes and others hold, but in our idea of what is right. Laws are just or unjust in so far as they do or do not conform to that idea. Justice may be distinguished as ethical, economical, and political. The first consists in doing justice between man and man as men; the second, in doing justice between the members of a family or household; and the third, in doing justice between the members of a community or commonwealth (More, *Enchiridion Ethicum*; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*). Dr. Watts gives the following rules respecting justice

- 1.** It is just that we honor, reverence, and respect those who are superiors in any kind (**<408>**Ephesians 6:1, 3; **<4027>**1 Peter 2:17; **<5457>**1 Timothy 5:17).
- 2.** That we show particular kindness to near relations (**<2067>**Proverbs 16:17).
- 3.** That we love those who love us, and show gratitude to those who have done us good (**<8015>**Galatians 4:15).
- 4.** That we pay the full due to those whom we bargain or deal with (Romans 13; **<1244>**Deuteronomy 24:14).
- 5.** That we help our fellow creatures in cases of great necessity (**<0224>**Exodus 22:4).

6. Reparation to those whom we have willfully injured" (Watts, *Sermons*, serm. 24, 26, vol. 2). See Wollaston, *Religion of Nature*, p. 137, 141; Jay, *Sermons*, 2, 131.

Justice Of God

is that perfection whereby he is infinitely righteous, both in himself and in all his proceedings. Mr. Ryland defines it thus: "The ardent inclination of his will to prescribe equal laws as the supreme governor; and to, dispense equal rewards and punishments as the supreme judge" (^{<66015>}Revelation 16:5; ^{<49317>}Psalms 145:7; 97:1, 2). This attribute of the Supreme Being is the necessary result of the divine holiness, as exhibited in all his external relations to intelligent creatures. As holiness, in relation to God, is subjective, declaring his perfect purity justice is objective, exhibiting his opposition to sin as the transgression of his law. (These two aspects are exactly exhibited by the two Hebrew *terms* above.) Divine justice is distinguished as legislative, and rectoral or distributive. *Legislative* justice must approve and require that rational creatures conform their internal and external acts to the dictates of the moral law, which, either by the influence of the Holy Spirit on the conscience or by direct revelation, has been made *known* to all men. *Rectoral* or *distributive* justice is God's dealing with his accountable creatures according to the sanctions of his law, rewarding or punishing them according to their deserts (^{<13914>}Psalms 89:14). The latter is again distinguished into remunerative and punitive justice. Remunerative justice is a distribution of rewards, the rule of which is not the merit of the creature, but God's own gracious promise (^{<30112>}James 1:12; ^{<5048>}2 Timothy 4:8). Punitive or vindictive justice is the infliction of punishment for any sin committed by men (^{<50016>}2 Thessalonians 1:6). That God will not let sin go unpunished is evident:

1. From the word of God (^{<02416>}Exodus 34:6, 7; Number 14:18; ^{<40018>}Nehemiah 1:3);
2. From the nature of God (^{<23013>}Isaiah 1:13, 14; Psalm 5, 5, 6; ^{<38129>}Hebrews 12:29);
3. From sin being punished in Christ, the surety of his people (^{<4018>}1 Peter 3:18);
4. From all the various natural evils which men bear in the present state.

The use we should make of this doctrine is this:

1. We should learn the dreadful nature of sin, and the inevitable ruin of impenitent sinners (^{<39917>}Psalm 9:17).
2. We should highly appreciate the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom justice is satisfied (^{<4018>}1 Peter 3:18).
3. We should imitate the justice of God by cherishing an ardent regard to the rights of God and to the rights of mankind.
4. We should abhor all sin, as it strikes directly at the justice of God.
5. We should derive comfort from the consideration that the judge of all the earth will do right as regards ourselves, the Church, and the world at large (^{<3970>}Psalm 97:1, 2).

See Ryland, *Contemp.* 2, 439; Witsius, *Economy*, lib. 11, ch. 8, 11; Owen, *On the Justice of God*; Gill, *Bode of Divinity*, 1, 155, 8vo; Elisha Cole, *On the Righteousness of God*;

Justice, Administration Of.

This seems to have been one of the first subjects which claimed the attention of the great lawgiver of the Hebrews. It appears from the advice of Jethro to Moses when "Israel was encamped at the Mount of God" (^{<4083>}Exodus 18:13-24). When Jethro had seen how constantly and laboriously Moses was occupied in "judging between one and another," he advised him to make some other provision in relation to the matter, and to restrict himself to the work which properly belonged to him, as the inspired teacher and leader of the people. This was accordingly done. A civil magistracy was created in a form adapted to the existing wants of the people, and by reference to the record we shall find how fully it covers every essential point in the case. The value of evidence in conducting trials; the principles upon which verdicts should be rendered, both in civil and criminal cases, together with the great institution of trial by jury, are all found in greater or less development in the statutes and ordinances given from God to the Hebrews.

Their courts of justice were of various grades, some known as high courts of appeal, and others so simple and multiplied as to carry the administration of justice to every man's door, and effectually to secure the parties against that ruinous evil, "the law's delay." "Judges and offices shalt

thou make in all thy gates," was the command; and to what minute subdivision this creation of tribunals was carried out, we see in the ordinance directing that there should be "rulers over thousands, rulers over hundreds, rulers over fifties, and rulers over tens, who should judge the people at all seasons."

The candidates for office were not to be selected from any one privileged class. They were taken "out of all the people." They were required to be well known for their intellectual and moral worth and their fitness for the station to which they were chosen. They were to be "able men, such as fear God; men of truth, hating covetousness;" "wise men, and understanding, and known among the tribes;" and these qualifications being not only all important, but all sufficient, none others were required.

With a judiciary constructed after this manner, justice could be administered promptly and freely; and, on the other hand, a remedy was provided against the evils of hasty decision, which could not fail in the end to discover and maintain the right of the case. And if "the best laws are those which are best administered," we shall find the ordinances given to the Hebrews for carrying the laws of the land into effect admirably adapted to their end, giving equal security to the poor and to the rich against violence and wrong. *SEE JUDGE; SEE TRIAL.* (E. de P.)

Justification

(some form of the verbs $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$), a forensic term equivalent to *acquittal*, and opposed to condemnation; in an apologetic sense it is often synonymous with *vindication* or freeing from unjust imputation of blame.

I. Dogmatic Statement. — This term, in theological usage, is employed to designate the judicial act of God by which he pardons all the sins of the sinner who believes in Christ, receiving him into favor, and regarding him as relatively righteous, notwithstanding his past actual unrighteousness. Hence justification, and the remission or forgiveness of sin, relate to one and the same act of God, to one and the same privilege of his believing people ($\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$ Acts 13:38, 39; $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$ Romans 4:5, 8). So, also, "the justification of the ungodly," the "covering of sins," "not visiting for sin," "not remembering sin," and "imputing not iniquity," mean to pardon sin and to treat with favor, and express substantially the same thing which is designated by "imputing or counting faith for righteousness." *SEE PARDON.* Justification, then, is an act of God, not in or upon man, but for

him and in his favor; an act which, abstractly considered, respects man only as its object, and translates him into another relative state; while sanctification respects man as its subject, and is a consequent of this act of God, and inseparably connected with it. *SEE REGENERATION.*

The originating cause of justification is the free grace and spontaneous love of God towards fallen man (Romans 15; 3, 24; ^{<5021>}Titus 2:11; 3, 4, 5). Our Lord Jesus Christ is the sole meritorious cause of our justification, inasmuch as it is the result of his atonement for us. The sacrificial death of Christ is an expedient of infinite wisdom, by which the full claims of the law may be admitted, and yet the penalty avoided, because a moral compensation or equivalent has been provided by the sufferings of him who died in the sinner's stead (^{<4007>}Ephesians 1:7; ^{<5014>}Colossians 1:14; ^{<469>}Revelation 5:9). Thus, while it appears that our justification is, in its origin, an act of the highest grace, it is also, in its mode, an act most perfectly consistent with God's essential righteousness, and demonstrative of his inviolable justice. It proceeds not on the principle of abolishing the law or its penalty, for that would have implied that the law was unduly rigorous either in its precepts or in its sanctions. *SEE ATONEMENT.*

Faith is the instrumental cause of justification, present faith in him who is able to save, faith actually existing and exercised. *SEE FAITH.* The atonement of Jesus is not accepted for us, to our individual justification, until we individually believe, nor after we cease to live by faith in him. *SEE IMPUTATION.*

The immediate results of justification are the restoration of amity and intercourse between the pardoned sinner and the pardoning God (^{<4001>}Romans 5:1; ^{<5023>}James 2:23); the adoption of the persons justified into the family of God, and their consequent right to eternal life (Rom 8:17); and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (^{<4028>}Acts 2:38; ^{<4044>}Galatians 3:14; 4:6), producing tranquillity of conscience (^{<4015>}Romans 8:15, 16), power over sin (^{<4001>}Romans 8:1) and a joyous hope of heaven (^{<5113>}Romans 15:13; ^{<4013>}Galatians 5:3). *SEE SPIRIT, FRUITS OF.*

We must not forget that the justification of a sinner does not in the least degree alter or diminish the evil nature and desert of sin. Though by an act of divine clemency the penalty is remitted, and the obligation to suffer that penalty is dissolved, still it is naturally due, though graciously remitted. Hence appear the propriety and duty of continuing to confess and lament

even pardoned sin with a lowly and contrite heart (~~2316~~ Ezekiel 16:62). *SEE PENITENCE.*

II. History of the Doctrine. —

1. The early Church Fathers and the Latin Church. — Ecclesiastical science, from the beginning of its development, occupied itself with a discussion on the relation of faith to knowledge; but even those who attributed the greatest importance to the latter recognized faith as the foundation. A merely logical division into subjective and objective faiths and an intimation of a distinction between a historic and a rational faith (in Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*. 2, 454; Augustine, *De Trinitate*, 13, 2), were of little consequence. Two conceptions became prevailing: Faith as a general religious conviction, particularly as confidence in God, and the acceptance of the entire doctrine of the Church, *fides catholica*. The formula that faith alone without the works justifies is found in the full Pauline sense in Clemens Romanus (1 *ad Corinthios*. c. 32) and is sometimes used by Augustine polemically in order to defend the freedom of grace and the priority of faith. More generally it is used as an argument against the necessity of the Jewish law (Irenaeus, 4:25 Tertullian, *adv. Marcell.* 5, 3). The oecumenical synods were instrumental in gradually giving to the conception of *fides catholica* the new sense that salvation could be found only by adherence to ecclesiastical orthodoxy. But as a mere acceptance was possible without a really, Christian sentiment, and as the Pauline doctrine was misused by heretics in an antinomian sense, it was demanded that faith, be proved by works. Church discipline developed this idea with regard to the sins of the faithful, so as to demand a satisfaction through penances and good works (Augustine, *Serm.* 151, 12). It became, therefore, the doctrine of the Church that such faith alone works salvation as shows itself in acts of charity, while to merely external works faith or charity is opposed as something accessory. Pelagius assumed only a relative distinction between naturally good works and the good works that proceed from faith; in opposition to which Augustine insisted that the difference is absolute, and that without faith no good works at all are possible. As salvation was thought to be conditioned by works also, it was, even when it was represented as being merely an act of God, identified with sanctification. The importance attributed to abstention created gradually a distinction between commands and advices, and the belief that through the fulfilment of the latter a virtue greater than required would

arise (Hermas, *Pastor Simil.* 3, 5, 3; Origen, *In Epistolam, ad Rom.* 3; Ambrose, *De Viduis*, 4, 508).

2. The Greek Church. — Little discussion and little controversy has occurred on this doctrine in the Greek Church. Faith and works together are regarded as the conditions of salvation. The words of James are referred to first, yet faith is declared to be the stock from which the good works come as the fruits. The description of faith proceeds from the definition in the Epistle to the Hebrews to the acceptance of the entire ecclesiastical tradition. Man is said to participate in the merit of the Mediator not only through faith, but also through good works. Among the latter are comprised the fulfilment of the commandments of God and of the Church, and, in particular, prayers, fastings, pilgrimages, and monastic life. They are considered useful and necessary not only as a means of promoting sanctification, but also as penances and satisfaction.

3. Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church during the Middle Ages. — The Scholastics regarded faith as an acceptance of the supersensual as far as it belongs to religion, differing both from intuition and from knowledge; and although essentially of a theoretic character, yet conditioned by the consent of the will; which, however, in the description of faith, is reduced to a *minimum*. Originally only God is an object of faith, but mediately also the holy Scriptures; as a summary of the Biblical doctrines, the Apostles Creed, and, as its explication, the entire doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. As an accurate knowledge of the doctrines of the Church cannot be expected from every one, the subjective distinction was made between *fides implicita* and *explicita*; the former sufficient for the people, yet with the demand of a developed belief in some chief articles. There was, however, a difference of opinion on what these articles were, and even Thomas Aquinas wavered in his views. Faith may, even upon earth, partly become a science, and appears in this respect only as the popular form of religion. It is a condition of salvation, but becomes a virtue only when love, as animating principle [forma], pervades it [*fides formata*]; with a mere faith [*informis*] one may be damned. The *fides formata* includes the necessity of the good works for salvation, but they must be founded in pious sentiment. All other works not proceeding from faith, are dead though not entirely useless. The necessity of good works is fully carried out only by the inculcation of penance as *satisfactiones*, but with constant reference to a union of the soul with Christ, and the moral effect of the good works. Justification, according to Thomas Aquinas, is a movement

from the state of injustice into the state of justice, in which the remission of sins is the main point, though it is conditioned by an infusion of grace which actually justifies men. As an act of God which establishes in man a new state [habitus], it is accomplished in a moment. Among the people the Pelagian views prevailed, that man, by merely outward works, had to gain his salvation, and the Church became, especially through the traffic in indulgences, a prey to the immoral and insipid worship of ceremonies. In opposition to this corruption, many of the pious Mystics pointed to the Pauline doctrine of faith.

4. Doctrine of the Reformers of the 16th Century and the old Protestant Dogmatics. — The Reformation of the 16th century renewed the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone, emphasizing in the sense of Augustine, the entire helplessness of man, and made it the fundamental doctrine of the Reformed Church. This faith is represented as not merely an acceptance of historic facts, but is distinguished as *fides specialis* from the general religious conviction, arising amidst the terrors of conscience, and consisting in an entire despair of one's own merit and a confident surrender to the mercy of God in the atoning death of Christ. Worked by God, it does not work as virtue or merit, but merely through the apprehension of the merit of Christ. Its necessity lies in the impossibility of becoming reconciled with God through one's own power. Hence this reconciliation is impossible through good works, which are not necessary for salvation, though God rewards them, according to his promise, upon earth and in heaven; but, as a necessary consequence, the really good works will flow forth from faith freely and copiously. The opinion of Amsdorf, that good works are an obstacle to salvation, was regarded as an unfortunate expression, which may be taken in a true sense, though it is false if understood in a general sense. As man is unable to satisfy the law supererogatory works and a satisfaction through one's own works are impossible. Justification through love is impossible, because man cannot love God truly amidst the terrors of conscience. Hence justification is a divine judicial act, which, through the apprehension of the justice of Christ, apprehended in faith, accepts the sinner as just, though he is not just. This strict distinction between justification and sanctification was maintained on the one hand against Scholasticism, which, through its Pelagian tendencies, seemed to offend against the honor of Christ, and to be unable to satisfy conscience, and on the other hand against Osiander, who regarded justification as being completed only in sanctification. The works even of

the regenerated, according to the natural side, were regarded by the Reformers as sins. The Reformed theology in general agreed with the doctrine of justification as stated above, yet did not make it to the same extent the fundamental doctrine of the whole theology. According to Calvin, justification and sanctification took place at the same time. The dogmatic writers of the Lutheran Church distinguished in faith knowledge, assent, and, confidence, assigning the former two to the intellect, the latter to the will. From *the fides generalis* they distinguished the justifying faith (*specialis seu salvifica*), and rejected the division into *fides informis et formata*. As a distinguishing mark, they demanded from a true faith that it be efficient in charity. For works they took the Decalogue as a rule; a certain necessity of works was strictly limited. But, however firmly they clung in general to the conception of justification as something merely external (*actus forensis*) and foreign (*imputatio justitiae Christi*), some dogmatic writers held that justification had really changed something in man, and indeed presupposed it as changed. Hollaz pronounced this doctrine openly and incautiously, while Quenstedt designated these preceding acts as merely preparatory to conversion.

5. Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation. — The Council of Trent, in order to make a compromise with the Pauline formula, recognized faith as the beginning and the foundation of justification, but the full sense which Protestantism found in it was rejected. This faith is the general belief in divine revelation, though in transition to a special faith, yet a mere knowledge which still gives room to mortal sins. Justification is remission of sins and sanctification, through an infusion of the divine grace, in as far as the merit of Christ is not merely imputed, but communicated. It is given through grace, but as a permanent state it grows through the merit of good works according to the commandments of God and the Church, through which works the justified, always aided by the grace of God in Christ, have to render satisfaction for the temporal punishment of their sins and to deserve salvation. Not all the works done before justification are sins, and to the justified the fulfilment of the commandments of God is quite possible, although even the saints still commit small, venial sins. A further development of this doctrine is found in the writings of Bellarmine. He admits faith only as *fides generalis*, as a matter of the intellect, yet as a consent, not a knowledge. Though only the first among many preparations for justification a certain merit is ascribed to faith. The Council of Trent had rejected the imputation of the merits of Christ only as the exclusive

ground of justification; Bellarmine rejected it altogether. He explicitly proclaimed the necessity of good works for salvation, though only a relative salvation. "The *opera supererogationis*, which were not mentioned at Trent, though they remained unchanged in tradition and practice, are further developed by Bellarmine. According to him, they go beyond nature, are not destined for all, and not commanded under penalties.

6. Modern Protestantism. — Socinus denied any foreign imputation, also that of the merit of Christ. When supernaturalism in general declined, the points of difference from the Roman Catholic Church were frequently lost sight of Kant found in the doctrine of justification the relation of the always unsatisfactory reality of our moral development to the future perfection recognized in the intuition of God. De Wette declared it to be the highest moral confidence which is founded on the communion with Christ, and turns from an unhappy past to a better future. Modern mystics have often found fault with the Protestant doctrine as being too outward, and approached the doctrine of the Roman Church. The Hegelian School taught that justification is the reception of the subject into the spirit, i.e. the knowledge of the subject of his unity with the absolute spirit or, according to Strauss, with the concrete idea of mankind. According to Schleiermacher, it is the reception into the communion of life with both the archetypal and historical Christ, and the appropriation of his perfection. Justification and sanctification are to him only different sides of the carrying out of the same divine decree. Many of the recent dogmatic writers of Germany have again proclaimed this doctrine to be the essential principle of Protestantism, some (Dorner, *Das Princip unserer Kirche*, Kiel, 1841) taking justification in the sense of a new personality founded in Christ, others (Hundeshagen, *Der deutsche Protestantismus*. Frankft. 1847) in the sense that God, surveying the whole future development of the principle which communion with Christ establishes in the believer, views him as righteous. One of the last dogmatic manuals of the Reformed Church (Schweizer, 2, 523 sq.) distinguishes conversion and sanctification as the beginning and progress of a life of salvation, and assigns justification to the former. See Hase, *Evangelische Dogmatik* (Leipzig, 1850) p. 310 sq.; C.F. Baur, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1847); Hahn, *Das Bekenntniss der evangelischen Kirchengeschichte in seinem Verhältniss zu dem der Römischen und Griechischen*.

III. Literature. — See, for Roman Cath. views, Möhler, *Symbolism*, ch. 3; Willett, *Syn. Pap.* 8, 67 sq.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, ch. 5; Bossuet,

Works, vol. 1 and 2 *Stud. und Krit.* 1867. vol. 2; D'Aubigne, *Hist. Reformation*, vol. 2; Forbes, *Considerations*, 1, 1; *Nicene Creed*; 1, 173; Hughes, *Works*, 1, 410. For Protestant views, see Buchanan, *Justification* (Edinb. 1867, 8vo; reviewed at length in *Lond. Review*, Oct. 1867, p. 179); *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* Oct. 1867, art. 6; Wesley, *Works*, 5, 255; 6, 106; Calvin, *Instit.* vol. 2; Cunningham, *Reformers*, p. 402; Planck, *Hist. Prot. Theol.* (see Index); Knapp, *Theology* (see Index); Wardlaw, *System. Theology*, 2, 67.8 sq.; Graves, *Works*, vol. 4; Monsell, 4, 232, 240; Waterland, *Works*, vol. 6; T. Goodwin, *Works* (see Index); Wilson, *Apostol. Fathers* (see Index); Martensen, *Dogmatics*, p. 390 sq.; Pye Smith, *Introd. to Theol.* (see Index); Burnet, *On the 39 Articles* (see Index); Carmich, *Theol. of the Scriptures*, vol. 2; Neander, *Prot. and Cath.* p. 131-146; *Ch. Dog.* 2, 66 sq.; *Planting and Train. of Christian Church*, vol. 2; Riggerbach, in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1863, 4:691; 1867, 1, 405, 2, 294; 1868, 2, 201; *North Brit. Review*, June, 1867; p. 191 sq.; Dr. Schaff, *Protestantism*, p. 54-57; *Good Words*, Jan. 1866 Heppe, *Dogmatics*, p. 392; *Biblioth.-Sacra*, 1863, p. 615; *Bibl. Repos.* 11, 448 *Christ. Review*, Oct. 1846; *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 7, 516; Ware, *Works*, 3, 381; *Journal of Sac. Lit.* 21; 1869, 3, 545; *Christian Monthly*, 1845, Jan. p. 102; Feb., p. 231; *New Englander* (see Index); Hauck, *Theolog. Jahresber.* Jan. 1869, 59; 1867, p. 543; *Bull. Theologique.* 1, 25, 41; *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* July, 1868, p. 537; *Brit. and For. Rev.* Oct. 1868. p. 683, 692; *Amer. Presbyt. Review*, Jan. 1867. p. 69. 202; *Evang. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1869, p. 48; *British Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1871, p. 144; *Church Rev.* Oct. 1870, p. 444, 462; *Zeitschr. wissenschaft. Theol.* 1871, 4.

Justin

surnamed *the Philosopher*, or, more generally, *the Martyr*, of whom Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 1, 4, c. 11) says that he overshadowed all the great men who illuminated the 2d century by the splendor of his name, was born towards the close of the apostolic age, that is, the beginning of the 2d century. He was the son of a wealthy Greek, Priscus, who had, in all probability, come to reside at Flavia Neapolis (erected on the site of the ancient Sichem), in Samaria, with the Roman colony sent by Vespasian to the city that bore his name. But little is known of his personal history. From one of his works, the *Dialogues with Tryphon* (c. 2 sq.), we learn that he traveled much in his youth, and studied ardently the various systems of philosophy prevalent in his day, searching after some knowledge which should satisfy the cravings of his soul. The myths and absurd worship of

the heathen had failed to satisfy the youthful soul longing to know God and the relations of God to man, and in turn Stoic and Peripatetic, Pythagorean and Platonist, were examined to set his mind at rest upon the vital question. By the Stoic he was told that, in philosophical speculation, the subject which he seemed to consider the most important was only of subordinate rank. A Peripatetic, at the end of a few days, informed him that the most important thing for him to attend to was to afford the philosophic instructor security for his tuition. By the Pythagorean he was rejected, outright, because he confessed himself ignorant of music, astronomys and geometry, which that school considered a necessary introduction to the study of philosophy, and so he turned in despair to the Platonists, at this time in high repute in the place in which Justin resided. At last he seemed to have gained the haven of peace; the Platonic doctrine of ideas could not fail to inspire young Justin with the hope that he "should soon have the intuition of God," for is not this the aim of Platonic philosophy? "Under the influence of this notion," he relates himself, "it occurred to me that I would withdraw to some solitary place, far from the turmoil of the world, and there, in perfect self collection, give myself to my own contemplations. I chose a spot by the seaside." Whether Justin still resided at this time at Flavia Neapolis — and in that case the quiet resort must have been the shores of the Dead Sea, perhaps the valley of the Jordan, north of this sea (Otto), or on some unfrequented spot of Lake Genesareth or whether, as seems more probable, he then resided at Ephesus, is a matter of dispute. In favor of Ephesus are Schröckh, Tillemont, Hilgenfeld, Dorner, etc. But, be the name of the place Flavia Neapolis or Ephesus, it was in his resort by the shore of the resounding sea attracted to it, no doubt, chiefly by the grandeur of the object he was seeking to solve, and the loveliness of the spot that we find him one day, while wrapped up in thought, pacing up and down by the side of the sea, which moaned in melancholy unison with his reflections, accosted by a man of venerable aspect, sage and grave, and soon the two are engaged in earnest converse on the subject ever uppermost in young Justin's mind. Somewhat enamored of the Platonic philosophy, he argues in its favor with the appositely present senior, and contends that at some future day it will conduct him into that nearer acquaintance with God, or, in the Platonists' term, afford him the "vision of divinity." But the meek old man, who is a Christian, contends that the goal which he is seeking to gain cannot be reached by any philosophical school or by unaided mind even of the highest order; the fallacy of Plato is proved in some two or three points of doctrine belonging to that system, and

finally the doubting and indocile disciple is visited with the curt and not gentle apostrophe, "You are a mere dealer in words, but no lover of action and truth; your aim is not to be a practicer of good, but a clever disputant, a cunning sophist." Once more the inquiring youth is baffled in his attempt to lay hold of the truth; he is again convinced that even from the foremost of heathen philosophers he cannot obtain the pearl for which he is seeking so earnestly. But with this intelligence there comes also the direction, "Search the Scriptures;" study the Hebrew prophets; men who, guided by the Spirit of God, saw and revealed the truth, and even foretold events future to their day; read the last and heroic words of the disciples of him who came to raise a fallen world, and to restore it to eternal and imperishable felicity. "Pray," ended the venerable Christian, "that the gates of light may be opened to thee, for none can perceive and comprehend these things except God and his Christ grant them understanding." Justin was impressed; he had often heard the Platonists calumniate the Christians, but he had always discredited the statements. He had frequently observed the tranquillity and fortitude with which these followers of Jesus encountered death and all other evils which appear terrible to man, and he could never condemn as profligates those who could so patiently endure. He had long believed them innocent of the crimes imputed to these consistent martyrs. He was now, prepared to think that they held the truth. He reflected on the words of the venerable stranger, and was convinced that they inculcated the "only safe and useful philosophy." From this time (the exact date is doubtful; the Bollandists place it in A.D. 119; it is generally believed, with Cave, Tillemont, Ceillier, and others, that it occurred in A.D. 133) his personal history becomes obscure, as he has but little to relate of himself hereafter, and as from other sources we cannot gather much on which we can depend. Certain it is that he at once enlisted in active service in behalf of the new cause. Retaining the garb of a philosopher, he ardently devoted himself, as is evinced by his works, to the propagation of Christianity by writing and otherwise. Tillemont argues, from the language of Justin (*Apolog. Prima*, c. 61, 605), that he was a priest, but this inference is not borne out by the passage, and, though approved by Maran, is rejected by Otto, Neander, and Semisch. That he visited many places in order to diffuse the knowledge of the Christian religion is probable (comp. *Cohortat. ad Groec.* c. 13, 34), and he appears to have made the profession of a philosopher subservient to this purpose (*Dialog. cum Tryph.* init.; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 11; Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 125). According to what is commonly deemed the ancient record of his

martyrdom (though Papebroche regards this as narrating the death of another Justin), he visited Rome twice. On his second visit he was apprehended, and brought before the tribunal of Rusticus, who held the office of *praefectus urbi*; and as he refused to offer sacrifice to the gods, he was sentenced to be scourged and beheaded, which sentence appears to have been immediately carried into effect. Several other persons suffered with him. Papebroche rejects this account of his martyrdom, and thinks his execution was secret, so that the date and manner of it were never known. The Greek *Menoea* (s. d. 1 Junii) state that he drank hemlock. His death is generally considered to have taken place in the persecution under the emperor Marcus Antoninus; and the *Chronicon Paschale* (1, 258, ed. Paris; 207, ed. Venice; 482, ed. Bonn), which is followed by Tillemont, Baronius, Pagi, Otto, and other moderns, places it in the consulship of Orphitus and Pudens, A.D. 165; Dupin, Semisch, and Schaff place it in A.D. 166; Fleury in A.D. 167; and Tillemont and Maran in A.D. 168. Papebroche (*Acta Sanctorum*, April 2, 107), assigning the *Apologia Secunda* of Justin to the year 171, contends that he must have lived to or beyond that time. Dodwell, on the contrary, following the erroneous statement of Eusebius in his *Chronicon*, places his death in the reign of Antoninus Pius; and Epiphanius, according to the present reading of the passage (*adv. Hoeres.* 46, 1), which is most likely corrupt, places it in the reign of the emperor Hadrian or Adrian, a manifest error, as the *Apologia Prima* is addressed to Antoninus Pius, the successor of Hadrian, and the *Secunda* probably to Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus, who succeeded Antoninus. The death of Justin has been very commonly ascribed (compare Tatian, *Contra Graecos* c. 19; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 1, and *Chron. Paschale*) to the machinations of the Cynic philosopher Crescens. The enmity of Crescens and Justin's apprehension of injury from him, are mentioned by Justin himself (*Apolog. Secunda*, c. 3). He has been canonized by the Eastern and Western churches; the Greeks celebrate his memory on the 1st of June, the Latins, on the 13th of April. At Rome, the Church of St. Lorenzo without the walls is believed to be the resting place of his remains; but the Church of the Jesuits at Eysstadt, in Germany claims to possess his body: there is, however, no reason to believe that either claim is well founded. The more common epithet added to the name of Justin by the ancients is that of "the philosopher" (Epiphanius, *l.c.*; Eusebius, *Chronicon*, lib. 2; Jerome, *De Viribus Illustr.* c. 23; *Chronicon Paschale. l.c.*; George Sylicellus, p. 350, 351, ed. Paris; p. 279, ed. Venice; Glijcas, *Annal.* pars 3, p. 241, ed. Paris; p. 186, ed. Venice; p. 449, ed.

Bonn); that of "the martyr," now in general use, is employed by Tertullian (*Adv. Valent.* c. 5), who calls him "philosophus et martyr;" by Photius (*Biblioth. cod.* 48, 125, 232), and by Joannes Damascenus (*Sacra Parall.* 2, 754, ed. Lequien), who, like Tertullian, conjoins the two epithets.

Works. — It remains for us to consider the writings of Justin Martyr, which, although not very voluminous, so far as they are known to be or to have been extant, are among the most important that have come down to us from the 2d century, not so much because they are apologetic as because they are the earliest Christian apologies extant. In their classification we follow closely, with Smith (*Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.), one of the latest editors of the works of Justin Martyr, J.F.C. Otto, who makes four distinct classes.

(1.) *Undisputed Works.* —

1. *Ἀπολογία πρώτη ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν πρὸς Ἄντωνῖνον τὸν Εὐσεβῆ*, *Apologia prima pro Christianis ad Antoninum Pium*, mentioned in the only two known MSS. of the Apologies, and in the older editions of Justin, e.g. that of Stephens (Paris, 1551, fol.) and that of Sylburg (Heidelberg, 1593, folio), as his second Apology, is one of the most interesting remains of Christian antiquity. It is addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius, and to his adopted sons "Verissimus the Philosopher," afterwards the emperor M. Aurelius, and "Lucius the Philosopher" (we follow the common reading, not that of Eusebius), afterwards the emperor Verus, colleague of M. Aurelius. From the circumstance that Verissimus is not styled Caesar, which dignity he acquired in the course of A.D. 139, it is inferred by many critics, including Pagi, Neander, Otto, Semisch, and others, that the Apology as written previously, and probably early in that year. Eusebius places it in the fourth year of Antoninus, or the first year of the 230th Olympiad, A.D. 141, which is rather too late. Others contend for a still later date Justin himself, in the course of the work (c. 46), states that Christ was born a hundred and fifty years before he wrote, but he must be understood as speaking in round numbers. However, Tillemont, Grabe, Fleury, Ceillier, Maran, and others, fix the date of the work in A.D. 150. "Its contents," says bishop Kaye, "may be reduced to the following heads:

[1] Appeals to the justice of the ruling powers, and expostulations with them on the unfairness of the proceedings against the Christians, who were condemned without any previous investigation into their lives or opinions merely because they were Christians, and were denied the liberty allowed

to all the other subjects of the Roman empire, of worshipping the God whom they themselves preferred.

[2] Refutations of the charges of atheism, immorality, and disaffection towards the emperor, which were brought against the Christians these charges Justin refuted by appealing to the purity of the Gospel precepts, and to the amelioration produced in the conduct of those who embraced Christianity; and by stating that the kingdom to which Christians looked forward was not of this world, but a heavenly kingdom.

[3] Direct arguments in proof of the truth of Christianity, drawn from miracles and prophecy. With respect to the former, Justin principally occupies himself in refuting the objection that the miracles of Christ were performed by magical arts. With respect to the latter, he states in forcible terms the general nature of the argument from prophecy, and shows the accomplishment of many particular prophecies in the person of Jesus, inferring, from their accomplishment, the reasonableness of entertaining a firm persuasion that the prophecies yet unfulfilled that, for instance, respecting Christ's second advent — will in due time be accomplished.

[4] Justin does not confine himself to defending Christianity but occasionally becomes the assailant, and exposes with *success* the absurdities of the Gentile polytheism and idolatry. In further confirmation of the innocuous, or, rather, beneficial character of Christianity, Justin concludes the treatise with a description of the mode in which proselytes were admitted into the Church, of its other rites and customs, and of the habits and manner of life of the primitive Christians." To this Apology, the larger one of the two, are generally appended three documents: (1) Ἀδριανοῦ ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιστολή, *Adriani pro Christianis Epistola, or Exemplum Epistoloe Imperatoris Adriani ad Minucium: Fundanum Proconsulum Asioe*. This Greek version of the emperor's letter was made and is given by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 4:8). Justin had subjoined to his work the Latin original (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:8), which probably is still preserved by Rutinus in his version of Eusebius, for which, in the work of Justin, the version of Eusebius was afterwards substituted. (2) Ἀντωνίνου ἐπιστολή πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας *A;iac, Antonini Epistola ad Commune Asioe*. It is hardly likely that this document was inserted in its place by Justin himself; it has probably been added since his times and its genuineness is subject to considerable doubt. It is given, but with great variation, by Eusebius. (*Hist., Eccles.* 4, 13), and was written,

according to the ext of the letter itself, as it appears in Eusebius, not by Antonius, but by his successor, M. Aurelius. (3) **Μάρκου βασιλέως ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον, ἐν ἣ μαρτυρεῖ Χριστιανὸς αἰτίους γεγενῆσθαι τῆς νίκης αὐτῶν** *Marci Imperatoris Epistola ad Senatam qua testatur Christianos victorie causam fuisse*. This letter, the spuriousness of which is generally admitted (though it is said by Tertullian, *Apologetics*, cap. 5, that a letter of the same tenor was written by the emperor), relates to the famous miracle of the so called thundering legion (q.v.).

2. Ἀπολογία δευτέρα ὑπὲρ τῶν Χριστιανῶν πρὸς τὴν Ῥωμαίων σύγκλητον, *Apologetica Secunda pro Christianis ad Senatam Romanam*.

This second and shorter plea for the Christians was addressed probably to the emperors M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus, or, rather, to Aurelius alone, as Verus was engaged in the East in the Parthian war. (See below.)

Neander adopts the opinion formerly maintained by Valesius, that this Apology (placed in the older editions before the longer one just described) was addressed to Antoninus Pius; but Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 4, 17, 18) and Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 125) among the ancients, and Dupin, Pagi, Tillemont, Grabe, Ruinart, Ceillier, Maran, Mosheim, Semisch, and Otto among the moderns, maintain the opposite side. Otto thinks it was written about A.D. 164; others place it somewhat later. Scaliger (*Animadv. in Chron. Euseb.* p. 219) and Papebroche (*Acta Sanctorum*, Aprilis 2, 106) consider that this second Apology of Justin is simply an introduction or preface to the first, and that the Apology presented to Aurelius and Verus has been lost, but their opinion has been refuted by several writers, especially by Otto.

Granted, then that this Apology was presented to M. Aurelius, we find it "occasioned by the punishment inflicted on three persons at Rome, whom Urbicus, the prefect of the city, had put to death merely because they were Christians. After exposing the injustice of this proceeding, Justin replies to two objections which the enemies of the Gospel were accustomed to urge. The first was, Why, if the Christians were certain of being received into heaven, they did not destroy themselves, and save the Roman governors the trouble of putting them to death? Justin's answer is, that, if they were so to act, they would contravene the designs of God by diminishing the number of believers, preventing the diffusion of true religion, and, as far as depended upon them, extinguishing the human race. The second objection was, 'Why, if they were regarded by God with an eye of favor, he suffered them to be exposed to injury and oppression?' Justin replies that the

persecutions with which they then were, and with which many virtuous men among the heathens had before been visited, originated in the malignant artifices of demons the offspring of the apostate angels, who were permitted to exercise their power until the designs of the Almighty were finally accomplished. Another objection, of a different kind, appears to have been urged against the Christians that, in exhorting men to live virtuously, they insisted, not upon the beauty of virtue, but upon the eternal rewards and punishments which await the virtuous and wicked. Justin replies that these are topics on which every believer in the existence of God must insist, since in that belief is involved the further belief that he will reward the good and punish the bad. With respect to direct arguments to prove the divine origin of Christianity, that which Justin principally urges is drawn from the fact that no man ever consented to die in attestation of the truth of any philosophical tenets; whereas men, even from the lowest ranks of life, braved danger and death in the cause of the Gospel. Towards the conclusion of the tract, Justin states that he was himself induced to embrace Christianity by observing, the courage and constancy with which its professors encountered all the terrors of persecution." Two *Fragmenta*, given by Grabe in his *Spicileg.* saecul. 2, 173, are supposed by him to belong to the second Apology, in the present copies of which they are not found; but the correctness of this supposition is very doubtful.

3. Πρὸς Τρυφῶνα Ἰουδαῖον διάλογος, *Cum Tryphone Judeo Dialogus.* This dialogue, in which Justin defends Christianity against the objections of Trypho, professes to be the record of an actual discussion, held, according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 4, 18), at Ephesus Trypho describes himself as a Jew; "flying from the war now raging, probably occasioned by the revolt under Barchochebas, in the reign of Hadrian A.D. 132-134. But, though the discussion probably took place at the time, it was not committed to writing, at least not finished, till some years after, as Justin makes a reference to his first Apology, which is assigned, as we have seen, to A.D. 138 or 139, It has been conjectured that Trypho is the Rabbi Tarphon of the Talmudists, teacher or colleague of the celebrated Rabbi Akiba, but he does not appear as a rabbi in the dialogue. The dialogue is perhaps founded upon the conversation of Justin with Trypho rather than an accurate record of it. After an introduction, in which Justin gives an account of the manner of his conversion to Christianity, and earnestly exhorts Trypho to follow his example, Trypho replies to the exhortation by saying that Justin would have acted more wisely in adhering to any one of

the philosophical sects to which he had formerly been attached than in leaving God, and placing all his reliance upon a man. In the former case, if he lived virtuously, he might hope to obtain salvation; in the latter he could have no hope. His only safe course, therefore, was to be circumcised, and comply with the other requisitions of the Mosaic law. Justin answers that the Christians had not deserted God, though they no longer observed the ceremonial law. They worshipped the God who brought the forefathers of the Jews out of the land of Egypt, and gave the law, but who had plainly declared by the prophets that he would give a new law — a law appointing a new mode of purification from sin, by the baptism of repentance and of the knowledge of God — and requiring a spiritual, not a carnal circumcision. The ceremonial law was, in truth, given to the Jews on account of the hardness of their heart, as a mark of God's displeasure at their apostasy, when they made the golden calf in Horeb. All its ordinances, its sacrifices, its Sabbath, the prohibition of certain kinds of food, were designed to counteract the inveterate tendency of the Jews to fall into idolatry. If, says Justin, we contend that the ceremonial law is of universal and perpetual obligation, we run the hazard of charging God with inconsistency, as if he had appointed different modes of justification at different times; since they who lived before Abraham were not circumcised, and they who lived before Moses neither observed the Sabbath nor offered sacrifices, although God bore testimony to them that they were righteous. Having, as he thinks, satisfactorily proved that the ceremonial law is no longer binding, Justin replies to an argument used by Trypho, that the prophecy of ⁽²⁰⁰⁾Daniel 7:9 taught the Jews to expect that the Messiah would be great and glorious; whereas the Messiah of the Christians was unhonored and inglorious, and fell under the extreme curse of the law, for he was crucified. Justin's answer is, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament speak of two advents of the Messiah, one in humiliation and the other in glory; though the Jews, blinded by their prejudices, looked only to those passages which foretold the latter. He then proceeds to quote passages of the Old Testament in which, the Messiah is called God, and Lord of Hosts. In this part of the dialogue Justin extracts from the Old Testament several texts in which he finds allusions to the Gospel history. Thus the paschal lamb was a type of Christ's crucifixion; the offering of fine flour for those who were cleansed from the leprosy was a type of the bread in the Eucharist; the twelve bells attached to the robe of the high priest, of the twelve apostles. Justin next undertakes to prove that the various prophecies respecting the Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus; but, having

quoted Isaiah 7 to prove that the Messiah was to be born of a virgin, he first runs into a digression caused by an inquiry from Trypho, whether Jews who led holy lives, like Job, Enoch, and Noah, but observed the Mosaic law, could be saved; and afterwards into a second digression, occasioned by a remark of Trypho's that the Christian doctrine respecting the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, and his subsequent assumption of humanity, was monstrous and absurd. Combating these points, Trypho next inquires" of Justin whether he really believes that Jerusalem would be rebuilt, and all the Gentiles, as well as the Jews and proselytes, collected there under the government of the Messiah; or whether he merely professed such a belief in order to conciliate the Jews. Justin, in answer, admits that the belief was not universal among the orthodox Christians, but that he himself maintained that the dead would rise again in the body, and live for a thousand years in Jerusalem, which would be rebuilt, and beautified and enlarged. He appeals in support of his opinion to Isaiah, and to the Apocalypse, which he ascribes to John, one of Christ's apostles. Justin then concludes the interview by debating the conversion of the Gentiles. He contends that the Christians are the true people of God, inasmuch as they fulfill the spiritual meaning of the law, and do not merely conform, like the Jews, to the letter. They have the true circumcision of the heart; they are the true race of priests dedicated to God, and typified by Jesus, the high priest in the prophecy of Zechariah; they offer the true spiritual sacrifices which are pleasing to God, agreeably to the prophecy of Malachi; they are the seed promised to Abraham, because they are actuated by the same principle of faith which actuated Abraham; they are, in a word; the true Israel. The dialogue with Trypho appears to be mutilated, but to what extent is a matter of dispute. "Two fragments are assigned to it by Grabe (*Spicilegium*, saec. 2, 175), but it is doubtful with what correctness. "It is to be observed," says Smith (*Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*), "that, although Otto ranks the *Dialogus cum Tryphone* among the undisputed works of Justin, its genuineness has been repeatedly attacked. The first assault was by C.G. Koch, of Apenrade, in the duchy of Sleswick (*Justini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone... νοθεύσεως... convictus*), but this attack was regarded as of little moment. That of Wetstein (*Proleg. in. Nov. Test.* 1, 66), founded on the difference of the citations from the text of the Sept. and their agreement with that of the Hexaplar edition of Origen, and perhaps of the version of Symmachus, which are both later than the time of Justin, was more serious, and has called forth elaborate replies from Krom (*Diatribes de Authentia Dialog.*

Justini Martyr. cum Tryph.; etc., 1778, 8vo), Eichhorn (*Einleitung in das A.T.*), and Kredner (*Beiträge zur Einleitung*, etc.). The attack was renewed at a later period by Lange, but with little result. An account of the controversy is given by Semisch (book 2, sect. 1, ch. 2), who contends earnestly for the genuineness of the work. It may be observed that the genuineness even of the two Apologies was attacked by the learned but eccentric Hardouin."

(2.) *Disputed or Doubtful Works.*-

4. **Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας**, *Oratio ad Groecos*. "If this is indeed a work of Justin, which we think very doubtful, it is probably that described by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 4, 18) as treating **περὶ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων φύσεως** (compare Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 125), and by Jerome (*De Vir. Illustr.* c. 23) as being "de Daemonum nature;" for it is a severe attack on the flagitious immoralities ascribed by the heathens to their deities, and committed by themselves in their religions festivals. Its identity, however, with the work respecting daemons is doubted by many critics. Cave supposes it to be a portion of the work next mentioned. Its genuineness has been on various grounds disputed by Oudin, Semler, Semisch, and others, and is doubted by Grabe, Dupin, and Neander. The grounds of objection are well stated by Semisch (book 2, sect. 2, c. 1) but the genuineness of the piece is asserted by Tillemont, Ceillier, Cave, Maran, De Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, and by Otto, who has argued the question, we think with very doubtful success. If the work be that described by Eusebius, it must be mutilated, for the dissertation on the nature of the daemons or heathen deities is said by Eusebius to have been only a part of the work, but it now constitutes the whole.

5. **Λόγος Παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἑλληνας**, *Cohortatio ad Groecos*. This is, perhaps, another of the works mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius (1. c.), namely, the one said by them to have been entitled by the author "Ἐλεγχος, *Confutatio*, or perhaps **Τοῦ Πλατῶνος ἔλεγχος**, *Platonis Confutatio* (Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 232), though the title has been dropped, Others are disposed to identify the work last described with the *Confutatio*. The genuineness of the extant work has been disputed, chiefly on the ground of internal evidence, by Oudin and by some German scholars (Semler, Arendt, and Herbig); and is spoken of with doubt by Neander; but it has generally been received as genuine, and is defended by Maran,

Semisch (book 2, sect. 1, c. 3), and Otto. It is a much longer piece than the *Oratio ad Groecos*.

6. Πεπὶ μοναρχίας, *De Monarchia*. The title is thus given in the MSS. and by Maran. A treatise under nearly the same title, **περὶ θεοῦ μοναρχίας, *De Monarchia Dei***, is mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius (*l.c.*). The word **θεοῦ** is contained in the title of the older editions of the extant treatise, which is an argument for Monotheism, supported by numerous quotations from the Greek poets and philosophers. As, according to Eusebius, Justin had used citations from the sacred writings which are not found in the extant work, it is probable that, if this be the genuine work, it has come down to us mutilated. Petavius and Tillemont in a former age, and Herbig and Semisch in the present day, doubt or deny the genuineness of this treatises and their arguments are not without considerable force but the great majority of critics admit the treatise to be Justin's, though some of them, as Cave, Dupin, and Ceillier, contend that it is mutilated. Maran, understanding the passage sin Eusebius differently from others, vindicates not only the genuineness, but the integrity of the work. Some of the passages quoted from the ancient poets are not found in any, other writing, and are on that account suspected to be spurious additions of a later hand."

7. Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Διόγνητον., *Epistola ad Diognetum*. This valuable relic, of antiquity, which describes the life and worship of the early Christians, is by some eminent critics, as Labbe, Cave, Fabricius, Ceillier, Baumgarten-Crusius; and others, ascribed to Justin by others, as Tillemont, Le Nourry, Oudin, Neander, and Semisch, it is ascribed to some other, but unknown writer, who is supposed to have lived earlier than Justin. Grabe, Dupin, Maran, and Otto, are in doubt as to the author ship. Both Otto and Semisch give a lengthened statement of the arguments on the question those of Semisch, derived chiefly from a comparison of the style and thoughts of the author with those of Justin in his undisputed works, clearly point to some other person as its author." Comp. especially Pressense, *Early Years of Christianity*, 2, (*Martyrs and Apologists*), p. 591, footnote (N.Y. 1871, 12mo). (The fragment of Justin on the Resurrection is noticed under lost works.)

(3.) Spurious Works.-

8. Ἀνατροπὴ δογμάτων τινῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν, *Quorundam Aristotelis Dogmatum Confutatio*. "Possibly this is the work described by Photius

(Bibl. cod. 125) as written against the first and second books of the Physics of Aristotle. Its spuriousness is generally admitted; scarcely any critics except Cave, and perhaps Grabe, contend that it belongs to Justin; but its date is very doubtful, and its real authorship unknown.

9. Ἐκθεσις τῆς ὀρθῆς σμολογίας, *Expositio rectoe Confessionis*.

Possibly this is the work cited as Justin's by Leontius of Byzantium, in the 6th century; but it was little known in Western Europe till the time of the Reformation when it was received by some of the reformers, as Calvin, as a genuine work of Justin, and by others, as Melancthon and the Magdeburg centuriators placed among the works of doubtful genuineness. But it is now generally allowed that the precision of its orthodoxy, and the use of various terms not in use in Justin's time, make it evident that it was written at any rate after the commencement of the Arian controversy, and probably after the Nestorian, or even the Eutychian controversy. Grabe, Ceillier, and some others ascribe it to Justinus Siculus.

10. Ἀποκρίσεις πρὸς τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους περὶ τινῶν ἀναγκαίων ζητημάτων, *Responsiones ad Orthodoxos de quibusdam Necessariis Quoestionibus*. This is confessedly spurious.

11. Ἐρωτήσεις Χριστιανικὰ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, *Quoestiones Christianoe ad Groecos*, and Ἐρωτήσεις Ἑλληνικὰ πρὸς τοὺς Χριστιανούς, *Quoestiones Groecoe ad Christianos*. Kestner alone of modern writers contends for the genuineness of these pieces. It is thought by some that either these answers, etc., or those to the Orthodox just mentioned, are, the Ἀποριῶν κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας κεφαλαιώδεις ἐπιλύσεις, *Brief Resolutions of Doubts unfavorable to Piety*, mentioned by Photius (*Bibl. cod. 125*).

12. *Epistola ad Zenams et Serenum*, commencing; Ἰουστίνος Ζηνᾶ καὶ Σερήνω τοῖς ἀδελφῖς χαίρειν, *Justinus Zenee et. Serenofratribus salutem*. This piece is by the learned (except Grabe, Cave, and a few others) rejected from the works of Justin Martyr, Halloix, Tillemont, and Ceillier ascribe it to a Justin, abbot of a monastery near Jerusalem, in the reign of the emperor Heraclius, of whom mention is made in the life of St. Anastasius the Persian; but Maran considers that as doubtful."

(4.) *Lost Works*. —

- 13. Σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενημένων**, *Liber contra omnes Hoereses*, mentioned by Justin himself in his *Apologia Prima* (c. 26, p. 70, ed. Maran: 1, 194, ed. Otto), and therefore antecedent in the time of its composition to that work.
- 14. Λόγοι, Εὐγγράμμα κατὰ Μαρκίωνος, Πρὸς Μαρκίωνα**, *Contra Marcionem* (Irenaeus, *Adv. Hoeres.* 4, 6, conf. 5, 26; Jerome, *De Vir. Illustribus*, c. 23; Eusebius. *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 11; Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 125). "Baumgarten Crusius and Otto conjecture that this work against Marcion was a part of the larger work, *Contra omnes Hoereses*, just mentioned; but Jerome and Photius clearly distinguish them." The fragment *De Resurrectione Carnis*, preserved by Joannes Damascenus (*Sacra Parall. Opera*, 2, 756, etc., ed. Lequien), and usually printed with the works of Justin, is thought by Otto to be from the *Liber contra omnes Hoereses*, or from that against Marcion (supposing them to be distinct works), for no separate treatise of Justin on the Resurrection appears to have been known to Eusebius, or Jerome or Photius but such a work is cited, by Procopius of Gaza, *In Octateuch. ad Genes.* 3, 21. Semisch, however (book 2, sect. 1, c. 4) who, with Grabe and Otto, contends for the genuineness of the fragment, which he vindicates against the objections of Tillemont, Le Nourry, Maran, Neander, and others, thinks it was an independent work."
- 15. ψάλτης**, *Psalter*, a work the nature of which is not known; and,
- 16. Περὶ ψυχῆς**, *De Anima* — both mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 4, 18) and Jerome (*l.c.*), Besides these works Justin wrote several others, of which not even the names have come down to us (Eusebius, 4, 18), but the following are ascribed to him on insufficient grounds.
- 17. Υπομνήματα εἰς Ἑξαήμερον.**, *Commentarius in Hexaemeron*, a work of which a fragment, cited from Anastasius Sinaita (*In Hexaem.* lib. 7), is given by Grabe (*Spicil. SS. Patr.* vol. s. saec. 2, p. 195) and Maran (*Opp. Justin.*). Maran, however, doubts it is Justin's, and observes that the words of Anastasius do not imply that Justin wrote a separate work on the subject.
- 18. Πρὸς Εὐφράσιον σοφιστὴν περὶ προνοίας καὶ πίστεως**, *Adversus Euphrasium Sophistam, de Providentia et Fide*, of which a citation is preserved by Maximus (*Opus. Polemica*, 2, 154, ed. Combefis). This treatise is probably the work of a later Justin.

19. *A Commentary on the Apocalypse.* The supposition that Justin wrote such a work is probably founded on a misunderstanding of a passage in Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* c 9), who says that "Justin Martyr interpreted the Apocalypse," but without saying that it was in a separate work. The authorship of the work *Περὶ τοῦ παντός*, *De Universo*, mentioned by Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 48), was, as he tells us, disputed, some ascribing it to Justin, but apparently with little reason. It is now assigned to Hippolytus (q.v.).

Nearly all the works of Justin, genuine and spurious (viz. all enumerated above in the first three divisions, except the *Oratio ad Groecos* and the *Epistola ad Diognetum*), were published by Robert Stephens, Paris, 1551, fol. This is the editio princeps of the collected works but the *Cohortatio ad Groecos* had been previously published, with a Latin version, Paris, 1539, 4to. There is no discrimination or attempt at discrimination in this edition of Stephens between the genuine and spurious Works. The *Oratio ad Groecos*, and the *Epistola ad Diognetum*, with a Latin version and notes, were published by Henry Stephens, Paris, 1592, 4to, and again in 1595. All these works, real or supposed, of Justin were published, with the Latin version of Langus, and notes by Fred. Sylburgius, Heidelberg, 1593, fol.; and this edition was reprinted, Paris, 1615 and 1636, fol., with the addition of some remains of other early fathers; and Cologne, (or rather Wittenberg), 1686, fol., with some further additions. A far superior edition, with the remains of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and Hermias the Philosopher, with a learned preface and notes, was published, opera et studio unius ex Monachis congreg. S. Mauri, i.e. by Prudentius Maranus, or Marani (Paris, 1742, fol.). In this the genuine pieces, according to the judgment of the editor (Nos. 1-6 in our enumeration), are given in the body of the work, together with the *Epistola ad Diognetum*, of the authorship of which Maran was in doubt. The two Apologies were placed in their right order for the first time in this edition. The remaining works, together with fragments which had been collected by Grabe (who had first published in his *Spicilegium SS. Patrum* the fragment on the Resurrection from Joannes Damascenus) and others, and the *Martyrum S. Justinii*, of which the Greek text was first published in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Aprilis, vol. 2, were given in the Appendix. From the time of Maran, no complete edition of Justin. was published until that of Otto (Jena, 1842-44, 2 vols. 8vo; new edition, 1847-50, 3 vols. 8vo). The first volume contains the *Oratio et Cohortatio ad Groecos*, and the *Apologia Prima* and

Apologia Secunda. The second contains the *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, the *Epistola ad Diognetum*, the fragments, and the *Acta Martyrii Justini et Sociorum*. Numerous valuable editions of the several pieces appeared, chiefly in England. The *Apologia Prima* was edited by Grabe (Oxford, 1700, 8vo); the *Apologia Secunda, Oratio ad Groecos, Cohortatio ad Groecos*, and *De Monarchia*, by Hutchin (Oxford, 1703, 8vo); and the *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, by Jebb. (Lond. 1719, 8vo). These three editions had the Latin version of Langus, and variorum notes. The *Apologia Prima, Apologia Secunda, and Dialogus cum Tryphone*, from the text of Robert Stephens, with some corrections, with the version of Langus, and notes, were edited by Thirlby and published, Lond. 1722, folio. It has been conjectured that this valuable edition, though published under the name of Thirlby, was really by Markland. The *Apologia Prima, Apologia Secunda, Dialogus cum Tryphone*, and the fragments, are given in the first volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland. We do not profess to have enumerated all the editions of the Greek text, and we have not noticed the Latin versions. Full information will be found in the prefaces of Maran and Otto. There are English translations of the *Apologies* by Reeves, of the *Dialogue with Trypho* by Brown, and of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles* by Moses."

Theological Views. — Of the more striking peculiarities of Justin's theological system, we present the reader a short but faithful summary from the pen of the late professor C. E. Stowe: "There is in every man a germ of the divine reason, a seed of the Logos, whereby man is related to God, and becomes capable of forming an idea of God. By this spark of the divine intelligence the better men among the pagan philosophers were illuminated; but more especially, and far beyond these, the prophets and inspired men of the Old Testament. Still this revelation was only fragmentary and partial. Only in Christ was the Logos, the divine reason, perfectly revealed. The Logos, the Word, is himself God, yet from God; the Word the First-begotten, the Power, the primitive Revelation of God. He is the only-begotten of God, yet without any dividing or pouring forth of the divine substance, but begotten solely by the will of the Father. The Son was with God before the creation; the Word of the Father, and begotten when God by him in the beginning created and ordered all things. As to his personal subsistence, he is distinct from God, but numerically only, not essentially; and subordinate to the Father, but only inasmuch as he has his origin and being from the counsel of the paternal will. As he is the first revelation of the Father, so he is the medium of all the subsequent

revelations of the divine light and life. He is the Creator and Governor of the world, the universal reason. He dwells in every reasonable being, in different measure, according to the susceptibility of each individual; and he was the leader and bearer of the Old Testament theocracy. He is the God who appeared to Moses and to the patriarchs. He it is who said, I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; and he was with such heathen as Socrates, though not with those who were ungodly. When the fullness of time had come, this Word, through the, Virgin, became flesh, according to the will of the Father, that he might participate in and bear our infirmities, and take away from us the curse of the law. In him were united and made objective the human reason and the divine intelligence; he was in the flesh both man and God incarnate, and thus the Savior of fallen men. This is the true and the only safe and saving philosophy; in comparison with this, all other philosophy has only a subordinate value; this alone works salvation, and here only can we recognize the divine, and attain to God. He who is filled with the spirit of Christ derives not his knowledge from the erring, and imperfect, and fragmentary reason, but from the fullness and perfection of reason, which is Christ himself" (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1852, p. 829 sq.). As a whole, the works of Justin Martyr everywhere attest," says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 2, 484), his honesty and earnestness, his enthusiastic love for Christianity, and his fearlessness in its defense against all assaults from without and perversions from within. Justin was a man of very extensive reading, enormous memory, inquiring spirit, and many profound ideas, but wanting in critical discernment. His mode of reasoning is often ingenious and convincing, but sometimes loose and rambling, fanciful and puerile. His style is easy and vivacious, but diffuse and careless. He is the first of the Church fathers to bring classical scholarship and Platonic philosophy in contact with the Christian theology. He found in Platonism many responses to the Gospel, which he attributed in part to the fragmentary, germ like revelation of the Logos before the incarnation, and in part to an acquaintance with the Mosaic Scriptures. With him Christ was the absolute reason, and Christianity the only true philosophy. His sources of theological knowledge are partly the living Church tradition, partly the Holy Scriptures, from which he cites most frequently, and generally from memory, the Old Testament prophets (in the Sept.), and the Memorials of the Apostles, as he calls the canonical gospels. He expressly mentions the revelation of John. But, like the Pastor Hermae, he nowhere notices Paul, though several allusions to passages of his epistles can hardly be mistaken, and Justin's position towards

heathenism was anything but the Ebionistic, and was far more akin to that of Paul. Any dogmatical inference from this silence is the less admissible, since in the genuine writings of this father not one of the apostles or evangelists is expressly named, but reference is always made directly to Christ. Justin's exegesis of the Old Testament is typological and Messianic throughout, finding references everywhere to Christ." See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 4, 8-13, 16-18; Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.* c. 23; Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 48, 125, 232, 234; *Martyrium s. Acta Martyrii Justinii*, apud *Acta Sanctorum*, April. vol. 2; and apud *Opera Justinii*, edit. Maran and Otto; Halloix, *Illustrium Eccl. Orient. Scriptorum "Vitoe, saecl. 2*, p. 151, etc.; reprinted, with a *Comment. Proevius and Notoe* by Papebroche, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, April. vol. 2; Grabe, *Spicilegium SS. Patrum*, 2, 133; Baronius, *Annales*, ad annos 130, 142, 143, 150, 164, 165; Pagi, *Critioe in. Baronium*; Cave, *History of Literature*, 1. 60, ed. Oxf. 1740-43; the ecclesiastical histories of Tillemont, 2, 344, etc.; Fleury, 1, 413, etc., 476, etc.; Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliotheque*, etc.; Ceillier, *Des Auteurs Sacres*, 2, etc.; Lardner, *Credibility*, etc.; Otto, *De Justinii Martyris Scriptis*; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Groec.* 7, 52, etc.; Semisch, *Justin der Martyrer* (Breslau, 1840-2; translated by Ryland in the *Biblical Cabinet*); Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythology*, 2, 682 sq.; Bp. Kaye, *Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr* (2d ed., revised, Lond. 1836, 8vo); Kitto, *Journal Sacred Lit.* 5, 253 sq.; Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Christian Lib.* (Edinb. 1867, T. and T. Clark), vol. 2; Neander, *Church History*, 1, 661 sq.

Justin The Gnostic

who flourished towards the close of the second century, has only recently become known to us through the *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus (5, 22; 10, 15), and of his personal history and origin very little information has come down to us. His system has a Judaizing cast, and is mostly based upon a mystical interpretation of Genesis. He propagated his doctrines secretly, binding his disciples to silence by solemn oaths. In his gnosis Justin made use of Greek mythology, especially the tradition of the twelve conflicts of Hercules. He assumes three original principles, two male and one female. The last he identifies with Eden, which marries Elohim, and becomes thus the mother of the angels of the spirit world. The tree of life in Paradise represents the good, the tree of knowledge the evil angels. The four rivers are symbols of the four divisions of angels. The Naas, or the serpent spirit, he made, unlike the Ophites, the bearer of the evil principle;

he committed adultery with Eve, and a worse crime with Adam; he adulterated the laws of Moses and the oracles of the prophets; he nailed Jesus to the cross. But by this crucifixion Jesus was emancipated from his material body, rose to the good God to whom he committed his spirit in death, and thus became the deliverer. Schaff, *Church History*, 1, 242, 243.
SEE GNOSTICISM.

Justin Of Sicily.

SEE JUSTINUS.

Justin I

or *the Elder*, Roman emperor of the East, born A.D. 450, was originally a swineherd. The soldiers of the Praetorian band forced him to accept the imperial dignity on the death of Anastasius in 518. He is noted in ecclesiastical history for his interference in behalf of the orthodox bishops who had been banished by the Arians, but whom he recalled, and for several edicts which he published against the Arians. Hearing of the destruction of Antioch by an earthquake, he laid aside the imperial robe, clothed himself in sackcloth, and passed several days in fasting and prayer to avoid divine judgment. He rebuilt that city and other places which were destroyed by the same calamity. He died in 527. *See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2, 677 sq.

Justina, St.

is said to have been born at Antioch, of Christian parents, and to have suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia in 304. St. Cyprian, surnamed the Magician, is charged with the attempt of her seduction by magic, and that her conduct led him to embrace the Christian faith. During the persecution ordered by Diocletian and Maximian they were arrested together, and, after suffering torture with great firmness, were sent to Diocletian at Nicomedia. The latter caused them at once to be beheaded. The Greek Church commemorates them on the 2d of October and the Roman Church on the 26th of September. The empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius the Younger, wrote a poem in three cantos in honor of St. Justina and St. Cyprian. *See Photius, Bibliotheca*, cap. 184; Tillemont, *Memoires*,. vol. 5; Dupin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. au troisieme siecle*; *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 27,309.

Justina Of Padua, St.

patroness of Padua, and, together with St. Mark, of Venice also. According to the hagiographers she was a native of the former city, and suffered martyrdom there in 304, under Diocletian, and according to others under Nero. We have no details on the event, however. Her relics, which were lost, were recovered (?) in 1177, and are preserved in a church of Padua which bears her name. In 1417 a convent of Benedictines in the neighborhood reformed their rules, taking the name of *Congregation of St. Justina of Padua*. This reform was followed by another in 1498, under the care of Luigi Barbo, a Venetian senator, whom pope Alexander VI created first abbot of the order. The congregation spread, and the monastery of Mount Cassin, having joined it in 1504, was made its headquarters by Julius II. Moreri considers the legend of this saint's miracles as fabulous, yet the Roman Church commemorates her on the 7th of October. See Tillemont, *Hist. de la Persecution de Diocletian*, art. 55; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Oct. 7th. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 27, 310.

Justinian I, The Great

(FLAVIUS ANICIUS JUSTINIANUS),

Picture for Justinian

emperor of the East, was born in 483 of an obscure family. He shared the fortunes of his uncle Justin, who, from a common Thracian peasant, was raised to the imperial throne, and, after the death of his uncle, Aug. 1, 527, was himself proclaimed emperor. He obtained great military successes over the Persians. through his celebrated general Belisarius, destroyed the empire of the Vandals in Africa, and put an end to the dominion of the Ostrogoths in Italy, which successes restored to the Roman empire a part of its vast possessions. But Justinian was by no means satisfied with the renown of a conqueror. Learned, unweariedly active, and ecclesiastically devout, he aspired to the united renown of a lawgivers theologian, and champion of the genuine Christian orthodoxy as well; and his, in some respects, brilliant reign of nearly thirty years is marked by earnest though unsuccessful efforts to establish the "true faith" for all time to come. Indeed, he regarded it as his especial mission to compel a general uniformity of Christian belief and practice, but by his persistency only increased the divisions in church, and state, as he was greatly misguided by his famous wife, who, though animated by great zeal for the Church, was

blindly devoted to the Monophysites. Yet, however unfortunate the efforts of Justinian in behalf of Christian orthodoxy resulted, so much is certain, that his aim was noble and lofty, and that he was actuated by the holiest of purposes. It is said of him that he spent whole nights in prayer and fasting, and in theological studies and discussions, and that he placed his throne under the especial protection of the Virgin Mary and the archangel Michael, He adorned the capital and the provinces with costly temples and institutions of charity. Among the churches which he rebuilt was that of St. Sophia at Constantinople, which had been burned in one of the civil commotions. This church is esteemed a masterpiece of architecture. The altar was entirely of gold and silver, and adorned with a vast number and variety of precious stones. It was by this emperor that the fifth (Ecumenical Council) was convened at Constantinople (A.D. 553) to secure the end for which Justinian was personally laboring — the union of the Church and the extirpation of heresies. His fame, however, rests chiefly on his great ability as legislator. Determined to collect all previous legislative Roman enactments, he entrusted to a number of the ablest lawyers of Rome, under the direction of the renowned Tribonianus, the task of a complete revision and digested collection of the Roman law from the time of Hadrian to his own reign; and thus arose, after the short lapse of seven years, the celebrated *Codex Justinianeus*, "which thenceforth became the universal law of the Roman empire, the sole text book in the academies at Rome, Constantinople, and Berytus, and the basis of the legal relations of the greater part of Christian Europe to this day." This body of Roman law, which is "an important source of our knowledge of the Christian life in its relations to the state and its influence upon it," opens with the imperial creed on the Trinity (for which, see Schaff, *Church History*, 3, 769) and the imperial anathema against the prominent Christian heretics. The whole collections of Justinian are now known under the style of *Corpus Juris Civilis*. The editions with Gothofredus' notes are much esteemed. The four books of Justinian's Institutions were translated into English, with notes, by George Harris, LL.D. (Lond. 2d ed. 1761, 4to, Lat. and Engl.). Justinian also wrote a *libellus confessionis fidei*, and a hymn: (ὁμογενῆς υἱὸς καὶ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, etc.). (J.H.W.)

Justinus Of Sicily,

bishop of one of the sees in that island in the latter part of the fifth century, was present at a council held at Rome A.D. 483 or 484, under pope Felix III, in which Petrus Fullo (Γναφεύς); or Peter the Fuller, was condemned

as a heretic for having added to the "trisagion" the heretical words "who suffered for us." Several bishops, among whom was Justin, desirous of recalling Peter from his errors, addressed letters to him. Justin's letter to Peter, in the original Greek, with a Latin version, *Epistola Justinii Episcopi in Sicilia, ad Petrum Fullonem S. Gnapheum*, is given in the *Concilia* (vol. 4, col. 1103, etc., edit. Labbe; vol. 2, col. 839, edit. Hardouin; vol. 7, col. 1115, edit. Mansi). The genuineness of this letter, and of six others of similar character from various Eastern or Western bishops, which are also given in the *Concilia*, is disputed by Valesius (*Observat. Eccles. ad Evagrium Libri dus, Lib. I De Petro Antiochen. Episcop. c. 4*), but defended by Cave (*Hist. Litt. 1, 458*), who, however, contends that the Greek text is not the original, but a version from the Latin. Pagi (*Critici in Baronii Annales, ad ann. 485, c. 15*) proposes to correct the reading of the title of Justin's letter from "Episcopi in Sicilia" to "Episcopi in Cilicia;" others; would read the name "Justinianus," but on what authority we do not know. Dodwell and others ascribe to this Justin the *Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, and the *Expositio Rectoe Confessionis*, reputed to be by Justin Martyr, and printed with his works. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr. 7, 53; 11, 661; 12, 655*. — Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. s.v.*

Jus' tus

(Ἰούστος, for Lat, *Justus, just*; a frequent name among the Jews, equivalent to **qyDæj** Josephus. *Life, 9, 65, 76*), the name or surname of several men. Schottgen (*Hor. Hebr. in Act. Ap.*) shows by quotations from Rabbinical writers that this name was not unusual among the Jews.

- 1.** Another name for JOSEPH *SEE JOSEPH* (q.v.), surnamed BARSABAS, who was one of the two selected as candidates for the vacant apostolate of Judas (^{<4012>}Acts 1:23).
- 2.** A proselyte at Corinth, in whose house, adjoining the synagogue, Paul preached to the Gentiles after leaving the synagogue (^{<4018>}Acts 18:7). A.D. 49.
- 3.** Otherwise called JESUS, a Jewish Christian, named in connection with Mark by Paul as being his only fellow laborers at Rome when he wrote to the Colossians (^{<5041>}Colossians 4:11). A.D. 57. Tradition (*Acta Sanctorum, Jun. 4, 67*) names him as the bishop of Eleutheropolis!

Justus, St.,

is the name of a Christian martyr who, with his brother Pastor (aged respectively twelve and nine years), when the persecution of Diocletian against the Christians began, in the face of certain martyrdom boldly avowed himself a Christian. For this alone they were cruelly flogged; and Dacian, at that time the governor of Spain, enraged at their courageous resignation, finally caused them to be beheaded.

Another St. Justus, celebrated in history, was bishop of Lyons, in France. His life gives us an insight into the customs of the 4th century. The monks, both in the East and the West, sought at that time to prevent as far as possible capital punishment, and often represented those who had undergone it in punishment of their crimes as martyrs. A man who, in an excess of rage had killed several persons in the streets of Lyons, fled to the bishop's church for protection. Justus, in order to shield him, delivered him into the hands of the authorities on the condition that he should be but lightly punished but the mob took him out of the hands of the officers and killed him. Justus, considering himself responsible for the death of this man, and henceforth unworthy of his office, fled to Egypt, where he remained unknown in a convent, and there died about 390.

Another St. Justus, a native of Rome, followed St. Augustine in his mission to England, and became, in 624, archbishop of Canterbury. He died Nov. 10, 627. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Justus Of Tiberias

(in Galilee), son of Pistus, one of the most noteworthy Jewish historians, flourished in the beginning of the Christian era. He was in the employ of king Agrippa as private secretary when the revolution in Galilee broke out, and though the city of Tiberias had been especially favored by the king, the Tiberian Jews soon followed in the course of their neighbors, and many, gathered, under Pistus and his son Justus, who, besides the advantage of a Greek education, was a great natural orator, and easily swayed the masses. As we have shown in our articles on Josephus and John of Gischala, Josephus desired ever the leadership, be it among his own nation or among the Romans, and Justus having made early advances in favor of the revolution, and quickly gained the confidence of the people, Josephus feared and hated him, and, as soon as the war terminated, took special pains to convince the Romans that Justus was the greater rebel of the two.

The conduct of Josephus towards Justus became still more unjustly severe after the latter had ventured to write a history of the war, now unhappily lost, in which the treacherous action of Josephus was laid bare. Indeed, Josephus himself makes the only avowed object of the publication of his "life" his vindication from the calumnies of Justus, who is accused of having falsified the history of the war with Rome (comp. Josephus, *De vita sua*, § 37, 65, 74), as well as of having delayed the editing of the book until the decease of Agrippa and the other great men of the time, because his accounts were false and he feared the consequences of his unjustness: an untruthfulness. Justus, according to Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 33), also wrote a history of the Jews from the times of Moses down to the death of Herod, in the third year of the reign of Trajan, but this work also is unfortunately lost. Some writers (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 9; Stephanus Byzant. s.v. **Τιβερίας**) speak of a special work of his on the Jewish War, but this may refer only to the last portion of his chronicle which Diogenes Laertius (2, 41) calls a **Στίμμα**. Suidas (s.v. **Ιούδοτος**) mentions some other works of Justus, of which, however, nothing is extant. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 3, 397 sq.; *Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 56 sq. (J.H.W.)

Jutland

a province of Denmark, contains, since the Peace of Vienna of Oct. 30, 1864, which regulated the frontier between Denmark and Germany, 9738 square miles; and in 1880 had 788,119 inhabitants. It constitutes the northern part of the Cimbrian peninsula, and is bounded on the north by the Skagerrack, on the east by the Kattegat, on the south by Schleswig, and on the west by the German Sea. Originally the Cimbri are said to have lived there; subsequently the country was occupied by the Juts, a Saxon tribe. At the beginning of the 10th century it was conquered by the Danish king Gorm, and since then it has been a part of the kingdom of Denmark. Christianity was introduced into Jutland by Ansgar (q.v.), and the Christianization of the country was completed within a comparatively short period. The first church was erected at Ribe. The Reformation was first carried through in the city of Viborg by the efforts of Hans Yansen a young peasant from the island of Fuhnen. Jutland has now four Lutheran dioceses Aalborg, Viborg, Aarhus, and Ribe. **SEE DENMARK.** (A.J.S.)

Jut'tah

(Hebrew *Yutah'*, *hFwy*, ^{<1655>}Joshua 15:55, Vulg. *Jota*; or *Yuttah'*, *hFyu* perhaps *inclined*, otherwise i.q. *Jotbah*, ^{<1616>}Joshua 21:16, Vulg. *Jeta*; Sept. **Ἰεττά** v.r. **Ἰάν** and **Τανό**), a Levitical city in the mountains of Judah, named in connection with Ziph, Jezreel, etc., in the neighborhood of Maon and Carmel (^{<1655>}Joshua 15:55). It was allotted to the priests (21:16), but in the catalogue of ^{<1367>}1 Chronicles 6:57-59, the name has escaped. Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v.) calls it a large village by the name of *Jettan* (**Ἰεττάν**), and places it eighteen miles south of Eleutheropolis, in the district of Daromas (the south). It is doubtless the village discovered by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 2, 628), four miles south of Hebron, and still called *Yutta*, having the appearance of a large Mohammedan town, on a low eminence, with trees around and where the guides spoke of the existence of old foundations and former walls. Schwarz calls it *Zata* in his *Palest.* p. 106, and Seetzen *Jitta* on his map.

"The selection of Juttah as a city of the priests suggests the idea of its having already been a place of importance, which is seemingly confirmed by early and numerous allusions to it in the inscriptions on the Egyptian monuments. There it appears to be described under the names *Tah*, *Tahn*, and *Tahn-nu*, as a fortress of the Anakim near Arba or Hebron; and it is not a little remarkable that another Egyptian document, the Septuagint, expresses the word in almost the selfsame manner, **Ἰάν** and **Τανό**, (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* April and July, 1852, p. 73, 316, 317)" (Fairbairn, s.v.).

The "city of *Juda*" (^{<1139>}Luke 1:39), whither Mary went to visit Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist (**εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα**), and where Zecharias therefore appears to have resided, has usually been supposed to mean Hebron; but, if the reading be correct, the proper rendering would be "to the city Judah," i.e. its capital, or Jerusalem (see Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. 12), notwithstanding the absence of the article (Winer's *Grammat.* V.T. p. 136). But, as this was not intended (see Rob. Valesius, *Epist. ad Casaubon.* 1613, p. 669), Reland (*Palest.* p. 870) has suggested a conjectural reading of "Juttah" for "Judah" (**Ἰουτά** for **Ἰούδα**) in the above passage of Luke, which has met with favor among critics (see Harenberg, in the *Nov. Miscell. Lips.* 4, 595; Paulus, Kuinol, ad loc.), although no various reading exists to justify it.

Juvencus, Caius Vettius Aquilinus,

one of the earliest Church historians and Christian poets, a native of Spain, was a contemporary of Constantine, and a presbyter of the Church. Living at the time when Christianity ascended the throne of the Caesars, he attempted to clothe the recital of Biblical events in the classic and elegant style of the best profane writers. About 330 he composed his *Historia evangelica*, a work in four books, dedicated to Constantine. It is the reproduction of the Gospels in Latin hexameters, following the text closely, especially St. Matthew's, and in the style imitating Lucretius, Ovid, and especially Virgil, thus making a sort of epic poem, after the model of the *Aeneid*. "The liberal praises bestowed upon Juvencus by divines and scholars, from St. Jerome down to Petrarch, must be understood to belong rather to the substance of the piece than to the form in which the materials are presented. We may honor the pious motive which prompted the undertaking, and we may bestow the same commendation upon the laborious ingenuity with which every particular recorded by the sacred historians, and frequently their very words, are forced into numbers, but the very plan of the composition excludes all play of fancy and all poetical freedom of expression, while the versification, although fluent and generally harmonious, too often bids defiance to the laws of prosody; and the language, although evidently in many places copied from the purest models, betrays here and there evident indications of corruption and decay. The idea that this production might be employed with advantage in the interpretation of the Scriptures, inasmuch as it may be supposed to exhibit faithfully the meaning attached to various obscure passages in the early age to which it belongs, will not, upon examination, be found to merit much attention" (Professor Ramsay, in Smith, *ut infra*). He also wrote parts of the Old Testament in the same manner, but of these we know only his *Liber in Genesin* (according to Jerome, *De script. ill.* 84, he wrote "nonnulla codem metro ad sacramentorum ordinem pertinentia"). The *Historia evangelica* was first printed by Deventer, s. 1. (probably 1490); then often reprinted, as in the *Collectio vet. Poet. eccl.* of Fabricius (Basil. 1564); the *Bibl. M. Lugd.* 4, 55 sq.; by E. Reusch (Francfort and Lpz. 1710); and later from a manuscript in the collection of the Vatican by F. Arevalle (Rome, 1792, 4to), and in the first book of Gebser. Extracts of the *Genesis* were given in Martene's *Nov. Collect.* tom. 9; and lately J.B. Pitra, in his *Spicilegium Solesmense* (Paris, Didot, 1852; *comp. Proleg.* 42 sq.), published both these verses from the *Genesis*, and other fragments from

the Old Testament, forming 6000 verses, and gained great credit by his efforts to prove their authenticity as works of Juvenus. See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 5, 277; Fabricius, *Bibl. med. et inf. Lat.* 4, 212; Gebser, *De Juvenci vita et scriptis adj. lib. i. hist. evang.* (Jena, 1827); Bahr, *Rom. Lit. Gesch.* (Suppl. 1); Smith, *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog.* 2, s.v.

Juxon, William,

a celebrated English prelate, distinguished for his faithfulness to the unfortunate king Charles, was born at Chichester in 1582, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, where he obtained a fellowship in 1598. He first studied law, but afterwards altered his mind, took orders, and was presented in 1609 to the vicarage of St. Giles, Oxford, together with which, after 1614, he held the rectory of Somerton. In 1621 he was chosen president of his college, after which he rose rapidly, through the interest of archbishop Laud, being successively appointed dean of Worcester, clerk of the closet, bishop of Hereford, dean of the Chapel Royal, and, in 1633, bishop of London. The sweetness of his temper, the kindness and courtesy of his manners, and his uniform benevolence, made bishop Juxon a general favorite, and archbishop Laud fixed upon him as a fit person to hold a secular office under government. This was one of Laud's fatal errors. He did not perceive and make allowance for the change of public opinion. Bishops had, before the Reformation, become great men by holding secular appointments, and the archbishop thought to restore the order to its ancient importance in men's eyes by reverting to the exploded system. He forgot that bishops held secular offices formerly from the necessity of the case, and because there were not a sufficient number of the laity qualified, and that the fact itself, though necessary, was still an evil, since it interfered with their higher and spiritual duties. In Laud's own time the laity were better qualified than the clergy for office, and the appointment of the clergy was justly offensive, both as an insult to the laity, and as leading the people to suppose that the bishops had nothing to do in their dioceses. Under this false policy, in 1625 Juxon was appointed to the post of lord high treasurer, the highest office at that time in the kingdom, and next in precedence to that of the archbishop and to the great seal, which had not been held by a clergyman since the reign of Henry VII. In 1641 he resigned this office, which, it was admitted by all parties, he had held without reproach. The general harmlessness of his character enabled him to remain for the most part undisturbed at Fulham. Nevertheless, he remained firm to his principles, and steady in his loyalty to the king, by

whom he was frequently consulted. He was in attendance upon the king at the treaty in the Isle of Wight, in 1648, and during the king's trial acted as his spiritual adviser. Bishop Juxon was also in attendance upon the king in his last hours upon the scaffold. Juxon continued in his position until the abolition of kingly government, by the House of Lords, and the establishment of a Commonwealth. He then retired to his own estate, the manor of Little Compton, in Gloucestershire, where he passed his days in a private and devout condition. At the Restoration, aged as he was, he was appointed, we might almost say by acclamation, archbishop of Canterbury in 1660. He was not able to exert himself much in his spiritual office, but he was a benefactor to the see, for during the short time he held the archbishopric he expended on the property fifteen thousand pounds; he moreover augmented the vicarages, the great tithes of which were appropriated to the see. He died June 4, 1663. By his last will, archbishop Juxon bequeathed £7000 to his alma mater. He left also £100 to the parish of St. Giles, of which he had been vicar; the same sum to four other parishes in Oxford, and sums for the repair of St. Paul's and Canterbury Cathedrals, and other charitable uses, in all to the amount of £5000. Wood tells us that he was a man of primitive sanctity, wisdom, piety, learning, patience, charity, and all apostolical virtues. Whitelock says of him that he was a comely person, of an active and lively disposition, of great parts and temper, full of ingenuity and meekness, not apt to give offense to any, and willing to do good to all; of great moderation, sincerity, and integrity, insomuch that he was the delight of his time. He wrote a *Sermon on* ~~✠~~ Luke 18:31: — a treatise, entitled *Χάρις καὶ Εἰρήνη*, or *Some Considerations upon the Act of Uniformity* (London, 1662, 4to). In this work he shows himself to be no friend to the scheme of a comprehension. A catalogue of books in England, alphabetically digested (Lond. 1658), bears his name. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

END OF VOL. 4